

HANDBOUND
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS

40 THE
1
CLASSICAL
REVIEW

EDITED BY W. H. D. ROUSE
AND A. D. GODLEY

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:

PROF. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D. (*Chairman*)

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A. (*Hon. Treasurer*)

E. HARRISON, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*)

PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.; PROF. GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.;

PROF. A. C. CLARK, M.A.; PROF. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A.

With the co-operation of—PROF. W. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; PRINCIPAL
W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; PROF. T. G. TUCKER,
Litt.D., University of Melbourne; PROF. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D.,
Harvard University.

VOLUME XXIX.

14165-9
12/2/17.

PUBLISHED FOR THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.

GINN AND COMPANY, 29, BEACON STREET

1915

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1.

Original Contributions:	PAGE	Reviews—continued:	PAGE
Notes on Some Inscriptions from Asia Minor. MARCUS N. TOD	I	Sturtevant's <i>Studies in Greek Noun-Formation: Labial Terminations III. and IV.</i> G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ	24
Demosthenes, <i>περὶ τῶν Συμμοριῶν</i> . J. R. WARDALE	5	Bezard's <i>Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils</i> . R. B. APPLETON	61
Note on the Parallelism between the <i>Prometheus Vincitus</i> of Aeschylus and the <i>Antigone</i> of Sophocles. C. R. HAINES	8	A New Edition of Firmicus. H. W. GARROD	27
Varia. H. RICHARDS	10	Short Notices:	
The Influence of the Interjection on the Development of the Sentence. FRANK GRANGER	12	<i>A Selection of Latin Verse</i> . Σ.	28
Notes:		Way's <i>Sophocles in English Verse</i> . Part II: <i>Aias, Electra, Trachinian Maidens, Philoctetes</i> . A. S. OWEN	28
Theocritus, <i>Idyll XV</i> . 112. R. J. SHACKLE	18	Harmon's <i>Lucian</i> . A. S. OWEN	29
Terence, <i>Eunuchus</i> , 835-839. J. S. PHILLIMORE	18	<i>Papyri Iandane</i> . A. S. H.	29
Horace, <i>Epistles</i> , II. i. 113-117. J. S. PHILLIMORE	19	<i>Two Elementary Latin Grammars</i> . W. E. P. PANTIN	30
Reviews:		Herbig, <i>Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen</i> . W. M. LINDSAY	30
Thomson's <i>Studies in the Odyssey</i> . A. SHEWAN	20	Asmus, <i>Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos</i> . R. G. B.	31
Misson's <i>Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios</i> . WILMER CAVE WRIGHT	22	Heisenberg, <i>Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt</i> . M. P.	31
Petersen, <i>The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ισκο -ισκη-</i> . G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ	23	Correspondence	32
		Books Received	32

No. 2.

Original Contributions:		Original Contributions—continued:	
Notes on Aeschylus <i>Persae</i> . J. T. SHEPPARD	33	The Waterfowl Goddess Penelope and her Son Pan. A. SHEWAN	37
Three Emendations in Theophrastus <i>Historia Plantarum</i> . ARTHUR F. HORT	35	In Propertium <i>Retractationes Selectae</i> . J. S. PHILLIMORE	40

Original Contributions—continued:	PAGE	Reviews—continued:	PAGE
Note on Ovid, <i>Tristia</i> III. 6. 8 (Augustus et Iuppiter). W. WARDE FOWLER	46	Magnus, <i>P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon</i> Libri XV. D. A. SLATER	56
Notes:		Short Notices:	
ἀσκήρ Σείπιος in Eur. <i>I.A.</i> 7-8. J. E. HARRY	47	Grenfell and Hunt's <i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> X. S.	60
Greek Elegiacs. S. GASELEE	48	Laurand's <i>Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines</i> . R. B. APPLETON	25
Notes on Vespa. R. T. C.	48	Murray's <i>Euripides and his Age</i> . R. B. APPLETON	61
Reviews:		Obituary	62
Clark, <i>The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts</i> . JAMES HOPE MOULTON	49	Notes and News	63
Three Chicago Monographs: Stark, <i>The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers</i> ; Robinson's <i>Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers</i> ; McIntosh, <i>A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis</i> . W. K. LOW- THER CLARKE	54	Version	64
		Books Received	64

No. 3.

Original Contributions:		Notes—continued:	
Clenard as an Educational Pioneer. FOSTER WATSON	65	Notes on Cicero (<i>Ad Atticum</i> , XIII. 37. 2). L. C. PURSER	79
Note on Euripides, <i>Hercules Furens</i> , 773-780. J. T. SHEP- PARD	68	Note on Varr. <i>L.L.</i> 5 § 173, Müll. F. W. G. FOAT	79
Plato, <i>Phaedo</i> 62A. G. A. DAVIES	69	Reviews:	
The Water Gods and Aeneas in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Books of the <i>Iliad</i> . GRACE HARRIET MACURDY	70	Cook's <i>Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion</i> . A. W. PICKARD- CAMBRIDGE	80
Horatiana. J. GOW	75	Meltzer's <i>Geschichte der Karthager</i>	85
Notes:		Larfeld's <i>Griechische Epigraphik, dritte Auflage</i> . MARCUS N. TOD	87
Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> II. 90 ff. R. G. BURY	77	Short Notices:	
Note on Plato, <i>Republic</i> , VII. 514B. H. RACKHAM	77	<i>Les Mystères d'Éleusis</i> . B.	89
On the Text of Plato, <i>Republic</i> , IV. 442A. H. J. ROSE	78	Harcum's <i>Roman Cooks</i>	90
A Note on the Meaning of <i>Exilis Via</i> (<i>Tristia</i> I. II. 86). ROBERT F. CROOK	78	Skutch's <i>Opuscula</i> . W. M. LINDSAY	90
		Bryant, <i>A Short History of Rome for Schools</i> . L. E. M.	90

Short Notices—continued:

PAGE

Heseltine's <i>Petronius</i> ; Rouse's <i>Seneca, Apocolocyntosis</i> . S. GASELEE	91
Schanz's <i>Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur</i> . H. W. GARROD	91
Clark's <i>History of Roman Private Law</i> . Part II.: <i>Jurisprudence</i> . J. S. B. R.	92
Besnier's <i>Lexique de Géographie Ancienne</i> . A. J. B. GREEN	93

Short Notices—continued:

PAGE

Ferguson, <i>The Legal Terms common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testa- ment</i> . J. H. M.	93
Obituaries	94
Correspondence	95
Books Received	96

No. 4.

Original Contributions:

Clenard as an Educational Pio- neer. FOSTER WATSON—II.	97
Notes on Greek Orators. H. RICHARDS	100
The Nationality of Vergil. G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ	104

Notes:

Aristotle, <i>De Mundo</i> , 399a, 7. W. L. LORIMER	111
Aristophanes, <i>Aves</i> , 488-498. W. L. LORIMER	111
Note on the Phrase *Ορχαμος 'Ανδρῶν. F. A. WRIGHT	111
Sophocles, <i>Trachiniae</i> , 331. J. E. HARRY	112
Sabinus' Edition of Persius. W. M. LINDSAY	112

Reviews:

Ure's <i>Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona in Boeotia</i> . JOHN L. MYRES	113
Wagner, <i>The Beginning of Life</i> . CLIFFORD ALLBUTT	115
Hall, <i>The Ancient History of the Near East, from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Salamis</i> . W. H. D. R.	116

Reviews—continued:

Burridge's <i>Nazareth and the Be- ginnings of Christianity</i> . W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE	118
Kühner's <i>Ausführliche Gram- matik der lateinischen Sprache</i> and Bennett's <i>Syntax of Early Latin</i> . W. E. P. PANTIN	119
Map, <i>De Nugis Curialium</i> . C. C. J. WEBB	121
Sihler's <i>Cicero of Arpinum</i> . ALBERT C. CLARK	124

Short Notices:

Bailey, <i>Some Greek and Roman Ideas of a Future Life</i> . FRANK GRANGER	125
<i>A School Atlas of Ancient His- tory</i> . G.	126
Fleschenberg's <i>Entwicklungsges- chichte des griechischen Ro- manes im Altertum</i> . S. GASELEE	126
Schoff's <i>Parthian Stations</i> . W. H. D. R.	126
Pais' <i>Studi Storici per l'Antichità Classica</i> . H. STUART-JONES	126

Correspondence	127
--------------------------	-----

Books Received	128
--------------------------	-----

No. 5.

Original Contributions:		Reviews—continued:	
	PAGE		PAGE
Clenard as an Educational Pioneer. FOSTER WATSON	129	Ramsay, <i>The Histories of Tacitus, and Fyfe's Tacitus: the Histories</i> . A. D. G.	149
On a Fragment of Comedy. A. D. KNOX	134	Hense's <i>L. Annæi Senecæ ad Lucilium Epistularum Moralium Quæ Supersunt</i> . J. WIGHT DUFF	150
An Attack on the Hellespont in 84 B.C. W. WARDE FOWLER	136	Dalton, <i>The Letters of Sidonius</i> . A. SOUTER	154
Note on Catullus, 84. A. J. BELL	137		
Notes:		Short Notices:	
Cases of Confusion between οὐδέ τι and οὐδ' ἐτι. J. E. SANDYS	139	Norvin's <i>Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Phædonem Commentaria</i> and Wilke's <i>Philodemide Ira liber</i> . R. G. BURY	156
A Correction of Isidore. VIII. xi. § 83. J. E. SANDYS	139	Aristotle's <i>Magna Moralia, Ethica Eudemia, De Virtutibus et Vitiis</i> . R. G. B.	156
The Active Construction kept with Passive Verbs. W. H. D. ROUSE	140	Aurich's <i>Hagios Nikolaos, der Heilige Nikolaos in der Griechischen Kirche</i> . A. G.	157
Reviews:		<i>Palaeographia Latina</i> . E. A. M.	157
Burnet's <i>Greek Philosophy</i> . A. C. PEARSON	141	Postgate's <i>Tibulli Carmina and Selections from Tibullus</i> . H. W. G.	158
Wright, <i>The Works of the Emperor Julian</i> . ALICE GARDNER	143	Pennell's <i>Pictures in the Land of Temples</i> . A. S. OWEN	158
Fairbanks' <i>Athenian White Lekythoi</i> and Riezler's <i>Weissgrundige Attische Lekythen</i> . P. GARDNER	145	Notes and News	159
Meusel's <i>C. Julii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Gallico</i> . W. E. P. PANTIN	146	Books Received	160
Royds' <i>The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Vergil</i> . E. C. MARCHANT	148		

No. 6.

Original Contributions:		Original Contributions—continued:	
Some Emendations of the Homeric Hymns. R. J. SHACKLE	161	<i>Mergere</i> and Priap. 65. A. E. HOUSMAN	173
The Fourth Foot of the Homeric Hexameter. A. SHEWAN	165	Some Codices Vossiani and the <i>Metamorphosis</i> of Ovid. D. A. SLATER	174
Herodotus and Babylon. F. HAVERFIELD	169	Reviews:	
Notes on Some Passages in Plato's <i>Laws</i> . R. G. BURY	170	Lamb's <i>Clio Enthroned: A Study of Prose Form in Thucydides</i> . J. T. SHEPPARD	178
Terentiana. J. S. PHILLIMORE	172		

Reviews—continued:

	PAGE
Bethe's <i>Homer: Dichtung und Sage</i> . A. SHEWAN . . .	181
Showerman's <i>Ovid, Heroides and Amores</i> . S. G. OWEN . . .	184
Weidmann's <i>Series</i> . W. E. P. PANTIN . . .	185
Garrod and Mowat, <i>Einhart's Life of Charlemagne</i> . C. W. PREVITÉ ORTON . . .	186
Louis Havet's <i>Notes Critiques sur le Texte de Festus</i> . J. S. P.	188

Short Notices:

	PAGE
Murray's <i>Hamlet and Orestes, a Study in Traditional Types</i> . M. P.	190
Dieterich's <i>Nekuia, Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrus-Apokalypse</i> . W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE . . .	190
Fogerty's <i>Sophocles' Electra</i> . A. S. OWEN	191
Correspondence	192
Books Received	192

No. 7.

Original Contributions:

" <i>Orsa</i> in Hesiod. T. L. AGAR . . .	193
A Note on the Word Accent in Greek Music. R. L. TURNER . . .	195
On an Archaic Thessalian Epigram. MARCUS N. TOD . . .	196
Catullus, LXXXIV. E. HARRISON	198
Horace and the Scholia. A. J. BELL	199

Notes:

Sophocles, <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> , l. 1219. A. E. ROCHE . . .	203
On the Derivation of 'Famulus,' 'Familia.' F. A. WRIGHT . . .	204

Reviews:

Pickard-Cambridge's <i>Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom</i> . O. H. T. RISCHBIETH	204
Jacoby's <i>Herodotos: Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie</i> . . .	207
Leach's <i>Schools of Medieval England</i> . FRANK GRANGER . . .	210

Reviews—continued:

Elliott's <i>Acharnians of Aristophanes</i> . A. S. F. GOW . . .	212
Eitrem's <i>Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer</i> . J. T. SHEPPARD	214
Murray's <i>Alcestis of Euripides</i> . M. P.	216
Conway and Walters's <i>Text of Livy I-5</i> . A. SOUTER . . .	217

Short Notices:

Cheesman's <i>Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army</i> . F. HAVERFIELD	218
Pohlenz's <i>Aus Platos Werdezeit</i> . MARIE V. WILLIAMS . . .	219
On Isidore, VIII. xi. § 83. SAMUEL ALLEN	220
Bury's <i>History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great</i> . S.	220

Obituaries	221
----------------------	-----

Correspondence	223
--------------------------	-----

Books Received	224
--------------------------	-----

No. 8.

Original Contributions:		PAGE	Reviews—continued:		PAGE
Virgil.	J. W. MACKAIL . . .	225	<i>Three Dialogues of Seneca.</i>	J. WIGHT DUFF . . .	251
Pindar, <i>Pythian</i> II. 90 ff.	J. T. SHEPPARD . . .	230	Short Notices:		
Plutarchi <i>Moralia</i> .	HERBERT RICHARDS . . .	233	Morey's <i>East Christian Paintings</i> <i>in the Freer Collection.</i>	W. H. D. R. . . .	253
The Probable Error of a Water-Clock.	J. K. FOTHERINGHAM .	236	Persson's <i>Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons.</i>	E. C. MARCHANT	254
Notes:			Kalinka's <i>Xenophontis qui inscribitur libellus Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία in usum scholarum Academicarum.</i>	R. G. B. . . .	255
Herodotus and Babylon.	PROFESSOR F. HAVERFIELD .	239	Appleton and Jones's <i>Pōns Tīrōnum.</i>	F. M. P. . . .	255
Livy I. 34. I.	M. T. TATHAM . . .	239	Obituary		
Reviews:			Correspondence		
Some School Books		240	Books Received		
Müller's <i>Aesthetic Commentary on Sophocles.</i>	A. S. OWEN	243	INDEX		
<i>The Oxford Aristotle in English.</i>	R. G. BURY and F. H. A. MARSHALL	244			
Walser's <i>Poggius Florentinus Leben und Werke.</i>	ALBERT C. CLARK	246			

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

NOTES ON SOME INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASIA MINOR.

I.—Πατρομύστης.

THE latest fascicule of the invaluable collection of *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* includes, together with a number of other texts from Smyrna, one (*I.G.R.* iv. 1393) which was published by Spon and by Muratori, and afterwards by Boeckh (*C.I.G.* 3173). It is a dedication to the Emperor Titus and his brother Domitian, attributed by Cagnat 'anno 80 post C.n.' The date can, however, be determined somewhat more exactly, since Titus is described as *δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ θ'* (*trib. pot. ix.*), and his ninth year of *tribunicia potestas* expired on June 30, 80 A.D. If, further, we suppose that Titus and Domitian were actually holding their eighth and seventh consulships respectively when the inscription was engraved, we must attribute it to one of the first four months of the year, since they were succeeded as consuls by L. Aelius Plautius Lamia Aelianus and C. Marius Marcellus Octavius Publius Cluvius Rufus certainly by June 13 (*C.I.L.* iii. p. 854) and probably on May 1.¹ After recording the names of the hereditary priest, the stephanephoros, the agonothetes, the xystarches, and the *διοικῶν*, the inscription proceeds (*a. l.* 14 ff.):

οἱ πεπληρωκότες τὰ ἰσηλύσια | Σουλ-
πίκιος Φῆρμος, | Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἀρτεμᾶ?

¹ Weynand *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa *R.E.* vi. 2719; Liebenam, *Fasti Consulares*, 16.

πατρομύστης, | Ἀπολλώνιος Εὐδήμος[υ] ?
πατρομύστης, | Τρόφιμος Ἀσκληπιάδου, ||
Τύραννος Παπίου τοῦ Μενάνδρου.

The inscription relates to the Guild, known to us from a number of epigraphical records, of which the full title seems to have been ἡ ἱερὰ σύνοδος τῶν περὶ τὸν Βρεισέα Διόνυσου τεχνειτῶν καὶ μυστῶν (*C.I.G.* 3190); of the nature of the god and the position of his sanctuary I need not speak, since the question has been recently discussed by Mrs. Hasluck (*B.S.A.* xix. 89 ff.). Several points, however, in the lines just quoted call for comment. In ll. 17, 18 Cagnat follows Boeckh in altering the Ἀρτεμᾶς and Εὐδήμος of the stone into Ἀρτεμᾶ and Εὐδήμος[υ] respectively, regarding them as patronymics. Now it is true that patronymics occur in *a* ll. 19, 20 and perhaps in *b* l. 5 of this inscription; but it is equally true that they are absent in seven cases and their presence is thus exceptional rather than normal. Moreover, the primary rule of epigraphy is not to assume that the engraver has erred save when forced to do so, and here there is no such necessity; for the possession of two names by the same individual is a common phenomenon in the Imperial period,² and though they are frequently united by ὁ καὶ, ὁ καλούμενος or some other phrase, this is by no means invariably

² See, *e.g.*, M. Lambertz in *Glotta*, 1913, 99 ff.

so. The inscriptions of Aphrodisias, for example, supply abundant evidence¹ as well as those of Pergamum,² while a further proof, if one be needed, of the same fact is furnished by the very inscription under discussion, where the name of the xystarches is given in *b* l. 7 as Διονύσιος Κικίνος νεώτερος).

The elaborate explanation of the phrase οἱ πεπληρωκότες τὰ (εἰ)σηλύσια given by Boeckh need not be repeated or discussed: εἰσηλύσιον is the regular term used in Imperial times for the entrance-fee charged by a society or guild, such as the Attic Iobacchi (*S.I.G.* 737), and the Pergamene ὑμνωδοί (*I.G.R.* iv. 353, *d* 13) and πρεσβύτεροι (*Ath. Mitt.* xxxii. 294, No. 18). The inscription, then, serves to record the fact that the five dedicators had duly paid their admission-fees. The first part of Cagnat's note, 'qui pecuniam debitam contulerunt cum in collegium admissi sunt, aut debitam ab aliis sua expleverunt,' is justified; for the second, however, there is no ground save an interpretation of the term πατρομύστης, according to which the patromystae are the leading members of the guild and therefore cannot have entered its membership quite recently.

Following Boeckh, Cagnat translates the term, which occurs elsewhere only in *C.I.G.* 3195, by 'mysta princeps, pater mystarum,' making it an honorary title.³ But it may be regarded as certain that the word, with which the cognate title πατρογέρων may be compared, denotes a hereditary member of the guild, one whose father is, or has been, a member. It was a common practice among the Greek societies to recruit their members as far as possible from the sons of those already admitted, and frequently these were charged a lower entrance-fee or sometimes none at all: hence arises the importance of noting in a list such as the present those who enjoyed this privilege.⁴

One question remains, which the editors have not discussed. What is the relation of the Σουλπίκιος Φίρμος, whose name occurs first among the newly-admitted members of the guild, to the Λ. Σουλπίκιος Φίρμος who is regarded as its financial manager (διοικητής)?⁵ Presumably not that of father and son, or the son would also be described as πατρομύστης. I am inclined to think that both names refer to the same person. The guild, it may be, required a manager and, having no one suitable among its existing members, it elected someone to hold the office in question; thus Firmus would stand last among the officials and first (taking precedence even of the two patromystae) on the list of new members. Another solution is to my mind more probable: in inscription *b* the list of officers comprises, in addition to the eponymous stephanephoros of the state, only the agonothetes and the xystarches; possibly therefore the phrase διοικούντος Λ. Σουλπίκιου Φίρμου does not point to the tenure of a regular office but to the responsibility undertaken by Firmus, as first on the list of newly enrolled members, for the erection of this monument. True, the words commonly used in this connection are ἐπιμελοῦμαι, ἐπιμελητένω, προνοοῦμαι, etc., or simply διὰ with the genitive,⁶ but the use of διοικέω in this sense does not appear to me impossible.

II.—Πρεσβύτερος.

In the inscription already discussed two names (*b* ll. 6, 7) are qualified by the addition of νεώτερος), equivalent to our 'junior.' This involves the existence of a correlative term for 'senior,' which can hardly be any other than πρεσβύτερος. In Athens the use of these terms in the Imperial period is very common,⁷ in Laconia νεώτερος is used in this way (*I.G.* v. 1. 40, 41, [43], 69) and possibly also πρεσβύτερος,⁸ in

¹ *C.I.G.* 2748 Εὐμαχος Διογένης, 2768 τὸν δεῖνα Ζηγᾶν, 2772 Μύωνα Μένανδρον, 2842 Φιλόξενος Πάνθηρ, etc.

² *I.G.R.* iv. 374, 384, 420, 497, etc.

³ Cf. such titles as πατήρ πόλεως, υἱὸς πόλεως, etc.

⁴ For the whole subject see F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, 298 ff.

⁵ F. Poland, *op. cit.* 378.

⁶ Larfeld, *Griech. Epigraphik*², 446 f.

⁷ *I.G.* iii. 1017, 1020, 1023, 1029, 1031-2, 1306, etc.

⁸ In *I.G.* v. 1. 1280, however, πρεσβυτέρα may represent the feminine form of the honorary title πρέσβυς τοῦ ἔθνους found in the same inscription.

Thessaly ὁ πρεσβύτερος and ὁ νεώτερος seem usual, though the article is sometimes omitted,¹ while in the west πρεσβύτερος and νεώτερος occur side by side in a Neapolitan text (*I.G.* xiv. 717, cf. 758), and the former is found also at Rome (1084) and at St. Gilles-sur-Rhône (2444). Examples from Asia Minor are rare, partly perhaps because the use of the term πρεσβύτερος in connection with the gymnasia and with many of the guilds and societies of the Graeco-Roman world,² and above all in the terminology of the Christian Church, made it less suitable for the purpose of distinguishing a father from his son who bore the same name. Yet the Attic usage was not unknown in the east. Besides the example from Smyrna already quoted we meet with a Π. Αἴλιος Ἀπολλώνιος νεώτερος at Magnesia ad Sipylum (*I.G.R.* iv. 1342) and at Artanada (*Dulgerler*) in Cilicia with Παππᾶς Ὁᾶς πρεσβύτερος,³ probably not a Christian presbyter, while at Adada (*Kara Baulo*) in Pisidia two inscriptions⁴ refer to a Βιάνωρ Ἀντιόχου πρεσβύτερος, whose pagan beliefs are attested by his tenure of the office of ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν. This gives us, I think, a key to the difficulty presented by a memorial inscription of Antioch in Pisidia (*J.R.S.* ii. 97, No. 26) set up by a certain [Αἴλιος] Κασ[σι]ανὸς [πρε]σβ[ύτερος]. The editor, Professor W. M. Calder, concludes that the inscription is Christian and adds, 'but the open use of πρεσβύτερος on an epitaph in a centre of persecution like Antioch would be very unlikely before A.D. 323, and the inscription has the appearance of being earlier than this date.' If we give to πρεσβ[ύτερος] the meaning 'senior,' the difficulty disappears, and the necessity is removed of dating the inscription in the fourth century of our era, from which Professor Calder rightly recoils.⁵

III.—Ἐπιτυχάνων.

Occasionally a difficulty is caused in the interpretation of inscriptions by the fact that many personal names are identical in form with common nouns, adjectives, or participles. Two examples, both involving the same mistake, have recently come to my notice in inscriptions from Asia Minor. In the *Revue Epigraphique* ii. 38 M. A. J. Reinach publishes a dedication found near *Kizil-Kewi* in the Troad, which runs—

Ἀπόλλωνι Σμινθεὶ Φλάουιοι Φιλούμενος
καὶ Ἀγαθόπους ὁ καὶ Βούρδων ἐκ
διαθήκης Τ. Φλαοῦιου ἐπιτυχάνοντος.

The dedicator set up this acknowledgment, the editor tells us in his paraphrase, 'après un succès qu'il attribuait sans doute au dieu.' That ἐπιτυχάνω can bear the meaning 'I am successful' is beyond doubt: it is used in this sense, for example, in the phrase ὁ καὶ ἐπέτυχον of *I.G.* v. i. 1146, l. 29, and in the participle ἐπιτυχόντα in *I.G.R.* iv. 791, 914, 1251.⁶ Further, a participle is frequently found in a votive inscription to denote the occasion or cause of the dedication, as in *I.G.* v. i. 1363 [Εὐ]νομία Διὶ τυχῶσα. Yet I am convinced that we must read Ἐπιτυχάνοντος in the inscription under discussion, since (i.) a *cognomen* is wanted to complete the *praenomen* and *nomen* Τ. Φλαοῦιου, (ii.) 'après un succès' would be represented by ἐπιτυχόντος, not by ἐπιτυχάνοντος, (iii.) 'in the hour of success' (which ἐπιτυχάνοντος must denote) cannot be meant, since this is a monument erected after the dedicator's death in conformity with his testament, and (iv.) Ἐπιτυχάνων (which has a feminine form Ἐπιτυχάνουσα and variants Ἐπιτύχχανος and Ἐπιτυχχανίων) is a common name throughout the Greek world in the Imperial period.

In a sepulchral inscription of Cyzicus (*I.G.R.* iv. 170), again, we need have no hesitation in restoring the proper name in place of the participle in the phrase ἐξέστω δὲ τῷ ἀπελευθέρῳ μου τεθῆναι Ἐπιτυχάνοντι ἰς τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν σορόν.

⁶ See also T. Sauciuc, *Andros*, 141, No. 9.

¹ *I.G.* ix. 2, 15, 19, 21, 29, 531, 1165, etc.

² F. Poland, *op. cit.*, Index, s.v.

³ J. R. S. Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, 89.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 403, 412.

⁵ Νεώτερος occurs also in Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 527, νέος is used in the same way *ibid.* 487. The restoration τοῦ νεώτερου in *C.I.G.* 2706 is quite uncertain, while the restoration Λέοντα τὸν νεώτερον in *C.I.G.* 2720, even if correct, is irrelevant to the present question.

A further example of the same source of misunderstanding may be mentioned here, as it occurs in the same volume as the last. A Samian honorary inscription of about 40 A.D. (*I.G.R.* iv. 981) opens with the words—

Ἡγεμονέα Λεωνίδου τοῦ ἡγεμονέως Καλλισθένην [ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν.

Ἡγεμονεύς is a well-attested by-form of ἡγεμών: Liddell and Scott give references to Oppian, Musaeus, and the Palatine Anthology, and we may add a Spartan epigram of the late second or early third century after Christ (*I.G.* v. 1. 540), which begins—

Τὸν κλυτὸν ἡγεμονῆα Χαρείσιον ἄνθετο
κούρα

Σπάρτας ἃ πρώτα, Πηνελόπειά νέα.

Yet in the Samian inscription Ἡγεμονέα and Ἡγεμονέως must be regarded as personal names, for (i.) the order of the words demands it, (ii.) ἡγεμονεύς is a purely poetical term, and (iii.) if it denoted a title or office it would be preceded by the definite article. We thus get in Ἡγεμονέα Καλλισθένην a further example of the possession of a double name which has been discussed above, while the insertion of the patronymics between the first and the second name is normal rather than exceptional.

IV.—Φιλόπατρις.

An error of the opposite kind has, I think, crept into one or two texts. An honorary inscription of Eumenia published in *C.I.G.* 3887 begins—

ὁ δῆμος Ἐπίγονον Μενεκράτους φιλόπατριν.

In Ramsay (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 377, No. 199) Φιλόπατρις becomes a second name of Epigonus, and this version is followed in *I.G.R.* iv. 741. I cannot but believe that we have here the honorary title φιλόπατρις, which is exceedingly common in the Imperial period, often in conjunction with similar titles such as φιλόκαισαρ, φιλορῳμαιος, φιλοσέβαστος, etc., and if it be objected that on a coin of the Augustan age Epigonus Philopatris is named,¹ we must remember that coins

frequently bear the titles of those mentioned upon them, even where they are of a purely honorary character, such as υἱὸς πόλεως.²

I would go further and strike out Philopatris as a personal name from *C.I.G.* 4411, an honorary inscription of Iotapa in Cilicia: there too it seems to me that there is no warrant for regarding it as such and no obstacle in the way of treating it as a title.

V.—Imperial Titles.

The value of Imperial titles as determining the dates of inscriptions is illustrated by the dedication from Smyrna from which these notes started. Occasionally, however, it is overlooked, as, for example, in two inscriptions of Thyssanus in the Rhodian Peraea recently published by Messrs. M. and N. Chaviaras (*Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ.* 1911, 62 f., Nos. 52 γ, 54). The first of these, attributed by the editors to the years 193-211 A.D., is in honour of Julia Domna and Septimius Severus, and the titles (Βρεταννικὸν μέγιστον . . . δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιη', αὐτοκράτορα τὸ ιβ', ὑπάτον τὸ γ') borne by the latter prove that the inscription was engraved in 210 A.D., between the bestowal of the title Britannicus Maximus and December 10, when the Emperor entered his nineteenth term of *tribunicia potestas*.³

The second, which is in honour of Caracalla, entitles the Emperor Βρεταννικὸν μέγιστον, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιγ', αὐτοκράτορα τὸ β', ὑπ[άτον τὸ δ] (ll. 3, 4). This inscription also, then, must be dated between the grant of the title Britannicus Maximus in 210 and December 10 of that year, when Caracalla began his fourteenth tenure of *tribunicia potestas*. Moreover since he held his third consulship in 208 and his fourth in 213, we are justified in restoring ὑπ[άτον τὸ γ'] in l. 4.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

² B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*², Index V.

³ Liebenam, *Fasti Consulares*, 109 f. By a slip Liebenam writes that Severus' trib. pot. xxiii = 10th Dec. 210—4th Feb. 211: for xxiii we must read xix.

¹ Babelon, *Invent. de la coll. Waddington*, No. 6027.

DEMOSTHENES ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΜΜΟΡΙΩΝ.

IN this important speech, delivered in 354 B.C. at the close of the Social War, when trouble with Persia was impending, there occur several difficulties which have not yet, I think, received sufficient attention. I propose in this paper to offer such suggestions as I can towards their solution.

In the Archonship of Nausinicus (378-7 B.C.) the Symmory system had been introduced for the purpose of raising the special war tax known as *εἰσφορά*. In 357-6 B.C., by decree of Periander, this system was applied in a measure also to the trierarchy; under Periander's system the 1,200 richest citizens (*διακοσίους καὶ χιλίους συντέλεις* Dem. in *Midiam*, § 155) were formed into twenty symmories. (Dem. *de Symm.*, § 17) for the purpose of defraying jointly the expense of keeping the ships of the fleet in serviceable condition. The system had, therefore, been in operation for three years, and its defects had now become apparent. To one of these, which Demosthenes evidently regards as serious, allusion is made in § 16. We learn that, owing to various exemptions, the number of persons upon the roll was liable to fall considerably below 1,200, and to remedy this the orator proposes to raise the number to 2,000, so as to insure that there shall always be *χίλια καὶ διακόσια σώματα*. It is manifest that there was some special object in fixing the number at 1,200; the clue appears to be furnished by the following passages. From Isaeus, vii., § 38 (*de Apollodori Hered.*) we learn that no one could be called upon to serve as trierarch oftener than once in three years (*δὺν ἔτη διαλιπών*), and Xenophon (*de Rep. Ath.* 3, § 4) tells us that four hundred trierarchs were appointed annually—*τριήραρχοι καθίστανται τετρακόσιοι ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ*. 3×400 gives us the number in question—1,200.

The object of Periander's system, then, was (as I suppose) to distribute the obligation equally among the wealthy citizens of Athens by an annual charge upon all alike who were liable to it, thus avoiding the clumsy process of *ἀντίδοσις* and the inequality which would

obviously be caused if one man were called upon to serve as trierarch in time of peace and another in time of war.

Even under his system, as we may gather from Demosthenes' criticism here and elsewhere, the burden often fell unequally, but into the details of the scheme by which Demosthenes further sought to equalise it—by the organisation of subsections of twelve members each with collective wealth of approximately the same amount, and by regulations for allocating ships of different classes equally to each subsection—we need not enter.

In § 19 we meet with another difficulty. If the 1,200 richest citizens were personally responsible for the expense of the trierarchy, why does Demosthenes propose to allocate to them *τὸ τίμημα τῆς χώρας*—the assessment of property for the purpose of the *εἰσφορά*? To this tax all citizens, who possessed as much as twenty-five minae, were liable and—perhaps from the first introduction in 378 B.C. at any rate for some time before 364 B.C. when Isaeus' sixth speech was delivered—the 300 richest men formed the first class. The tax was collected by the state for some years, but in 362 B.C. we read for the first time of a *προεἰσφορά* (Demosthenes, 50, § 8), the senate being requested to draw up a list of citizens required to advance the tax on behalf of their fellow-demesmen. At a later date (Demosthenes(?), 42, § 25) the 300 richest citizens (*viz.*, the first class) advanced it on behalf of all the tax-payers, irrespective of their parishes. It seems highly probable, then, that the orator is here proposing that, in lieu of any such arrangement as that of 362 B.C., the same 1,200 persons should be responsible both for the trierarchy and the advance of *εἰσφορά*. The cost of pay for the crews naturally being defrayed with other expenses from the money raised by the tax, it would obviously be a great convenience to put both of these matters in the same hands, and public attention had doubtless been directed to the unsatisfactory character of the existing arrangements

by the threat of war with Persia which was due to the aid which Chares (presumably from want of money to pay his men), had recently lent to Pharnabazus, the satrap in revolt against the great King.

I may perhaps here make a short digression, and urge some reasons for adhering to Boeckh's theory upon the term *τίμημα*.

The meaning of the term *τίμημα* has been much disputed; see Gilbert's *Greek Constitutional Antiquities* (Engl. transl., pp. 366 and following). Boeckh (*Public Economy of Athens*, pp. 515-519, Engl. transl.) maintained that the term denoted the proportion of property taxable, which was, by a graduated system, $\frac{1}{5}$ in the case of the wealthiest class, $\frac{1}{6}$ in the next class, $\frac{1}{8}$ in the third class, and $\frac{1}{10}$ in the poorest class of all. This view appears substantially correct; at any rate it squares with what Demosthenes tells us (*c. Aphobum I*, § 9)—*πεντεκαίδεκα τάλάντων γὰρ τρία τάλαντα τίμημα. ταύτην ἡξίουεν εἰσφέρειν τὴν εἰσφορὰν*—and does not appear to be inconsistent with the language of Polybius (2. 62 § 7), although at first sight it might be thought that he regards the *τίμημα* as equivalent to the whole value. Upon this supposition the total wealth of Athens must have been about 40,000 or 45,000 talents, for the average rate of taxation would have been upon about $\frac{1}{4}$ of the property, and the *τίμημα τῆς χώρας* is estimated here at 6,000 talents, by Philochorus (fragment 151) at 6,000, and by Polybius 2. 62 § 7 at 5,750 in the time of Nausinicus.

It has been objected that this sum—about 9 millions sterling—is inconceivably large, and various attempts have been made to explain the term *τίμημα* otherwise. Thus Beloch holds that 5,750 talents (the sum mentioned by Polybius) represented the total assessed wealth of Athens in 378 B.C., and as some property always escapes assessment, he thinks that the total wealth of Athens then was about 7,000 talents, a sum at which he arrives by elaborate calculations of the value of land, houses, slaves, etc., in Attica. It does not, however, on this assumption, seem easy to explain the clear statement of Demosthenes above cited *πεντεκαίδεκα*

ταλάντων τρία τίμημα, and the lease which Beloch cites (*C.I.A.* 2. 1058) may, I think, be satisfactorily explained upon Boeckh's hypothesis.

The lease stipulates that the tenant shall pay 54 drachmae by way of rent and *εἰσφορά* (if levied) *κατὰ τὸ τίμημα καθ' ἑπτὰ μνᾶς*: this Beloch understands to mean that the *τίμημα* was practically in this case equivalent to the full value of the property—a rent of 54 drachmae, at the usual rate of 8%, representing a property of approximately 7 minae. The repetition of *κατά* seems, however, rather to suggest that the proviso means 'εἰσφορά upon 7 minae, according to the assessment'; that is to say, if the lessor were required to pay *εἰσφορά*, upon his whole estate, at the rate *e.g.* of 1% upon $\frac{1}{5}$ of it, the lessee covenanted to pay the amount due in respect of the part here leased to him and valued for this purpose at 7 minae, viz. 1% upon $\frac{7}{5}$ minae or 1 $\frac{2}{5}$ drachmae.

Further, Beloch's calculations appear somewhat arbitrary, if I may venture to dissent from so great an authority.

Thus (i.) he estimates the number of slaves at 60,000 to 80,000, and the average value of a slave at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ minae.

Athenaeus, however (6. 272 B), cites Ctesicles as recording that a census was taken at Athens in the days of Demetrius of Phalerum, and 'that there were found to be 21,000 citizens, 10,000 metics, and *οἰκετῶν μυριάδας μ'*. No plausible emendation of the last number suggests itself, and if the figures are accepted as correct in the case of citizens and metics (as is usually done), there is no reason why we should demur to the 400,000 slaves; there may, no doubt, be some exaggeration, but it cannot be so great as Beloch supposes. It may perhaps be beside the mark to quote Thucydides, who tells us (vii. 27) that 20,000 slaves took refuge in Deceleia—an incredible proportion of Beloch's 60,000 or 80,000, as a very large proportion of the slaves at Athens must have been female slaves, and those who ran away would be practically all of them males—because it may be replied that there may have been many more slaves in 413 B.C. than in 354 B.C. But how are we to account for Demos-

thenes' computations in this very speech (§ 13)? He suggests raising '1,000 horse, hoplites as many as one wants, and crews for 300 ships': the latter item alone would require 60,000 men, the crew of each ship being about 200, and pre-supposes the intention to employ at least 40,000 or 50,000 male slaves as rowers.

Next for the average price of a slave. No doubt this is somewhat uncertain. Yet Xenophon (*Mem.* 2, v. § 2) represents Socrates as saying 'one slave is worth 2 minae, another $\frac{1}{2}$ a mina, another 5 minae, another as much as 10, and Nicias once gave a talent for a slave to act as overseer at the mines': even neglecting valuable slaves, worth 10 minae or more, we get an average value for ordinary slaves of $2\frac{1}{2}$, not $1\frac{1}{2}$, minae, and the probability is that the price would have gone up rather than down in the course of the fifty years since Socrates' death.

(ii.) Beloch estimates the *ἐπιπλά* at Athens at 1,000 talents, because Polybius (2. 62, § 4) declares that the value of the *ἐπιπλά* of all Peloponnesus did not amount to 6,000 talents in his own day; but surely this is not justifiable in view of the fact that there was only one important commercial city (Corinth) in the whole of the peninsula. Demosthenes himself tells us in this speech (§ 25) that the wealth of Athens was comparable with that of all other cities *ἐν ταύτῃ γῆματι* 'ἐνεστὶν ὀλίγου δέω πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς ἄλλας εἰπεῖν πόλεις'. The *ἐπιπλά* of Attica must have been worth more than that of Laconia, or any other of the six divisions of Peloponnesus.

(iii.) Beloch estimates 'vineyards, olive plantations, woods, pasture-land, and buildings' at 2,000 talents. It is difficult adequately to estimate many of these items, I think; but it would seem that the 31,000 citizens and metics (most of whom would be married) must have required some 20,000 houses to live in, and these alone could hardly have been worth much less than 2,000 talents, although Xenophon (*Oecon.* 2, § 3) is, I fear, too vague to be of much use in determining the average value of a house in Athens.

On the other hand, that the collective property of the Athenians must have

been worth some 40,000 talents may, I think, be shown by the following considerations.

In the speech against Leptines' law (delivered in 354 B.C.), Demosthenes discusses (§ 19) the number of additional Choregi which Leptines' law would secure. He says, οἱ μὲν τοίνυν πλουσιώτατοι τριηραρχοῦντες αἰεὶ τῶν χορηγιῶν ἀτελεῖς ὑπάρχουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐλάττω τῶν ἱκανῶν κεκτημένοι . . . ἔξω τοῦ τέλους εἰσὶ τούτου. This passage is no doubt difficult, but the difficulty vanishes if we take αἰεὶ to mean 'permanently,' and not 'from time to time,' and recognise that the 1,200 richest citizens were under Periander's system exempt from the minor liturgies because permanently responsible for the trierarchy. Two passages (Isaeus iii. § 80, and Demosthenes xxvii. § 64, c. *Aphobium* 1) show conclusively that no one could be called upon to serve any liturgy whatever, unless he possessed an estate of three talents. The πλουσιώτατοι, then, must have in every case possessed some four talents at the least, and many must have possessed much more. Demosthenes, who belonged to the wealthiest class, inherited fifteen talents. We may, then, fairly assume that they possessed seven or eight talents each on an average, or a total of 9,000 talents. The other 30,000 citizens and metics could not have possessed less than 30,000 between them.

Another suggestion is made by Gilbert himself, viz. that the *τίμημα* was the *maximum εἰσφορά* which could be demanded. But liability to a tax of 20 % *on capital* is absurd, and Demosthenes himself says in this speech (§ 27) that the Athenians would not hear of $\frac{1}{12}$ of the *τίμημα* (the supposed legal maximum) being demanded. No doubt he is speaking before hostilities had actually commenced, yet it is not the mere imposition of an *εἰσφορά*, but the imposition of an *εἰσφορά* of that amount that he says that his countrymen would not tolerate, and, as a matter of fact, the *εἰσφορά*, as we know, amounted regularly not to $\frac{1}{12}$ ($8\frac{1}{3}\%$) of the *τίμημα*, but to $\frac{1}{100}$. That was the average that his guardians paid during the ten years 378-368 B.C. for Demosthenes (18 minae on a *τίμημα* of 3 talents (= 180 minae) in

ten years, viz. 1 % per annum), and upon the only occasion since the system of Nausinicus had been introduced upon which the amount raised by *εἰσφορά* is specified, viz. in the year following this speech, the sum raised was 60 talents, that is (as before) $\frac{1}{100}$ of the *τίμημα* (Demosth. *Olynth.* iii. § 4). The other instance cited by Boeckh (p. 521) from the *Androtion*, § 44, I hope I have correctly explained otherwise; see *Classical Review*, 1892, p. 123. My emendation has, at least, the approval of the late Professor Butcher in his edition of the text.

In conclusion I wish to call attention to the figures in § 29 οἶδε μὲν γε διακοσίαις τριήρεσιν, ὧν ἑκατὸν παρεσχόμεθ' ἡμεῖς, τοὺς προγόνους αὐτοῦ χιλίας ἀπολέσαντας ναῦς, ἀκούσεται δὲ τριακόσιας αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς νῦν παρεσκευασμένους.

The number of Greek ships and of Athenian ships that fought at Salamis is variously represented. Aeschylus (*Persae* 338) states that the total number of Greek ships was 300, or, as some understand, 310.

Ἕλλησιν μὲν ἦν
ὁ πᾶς ἀριθμὸς ἐς τριακάδας δέκα
νεῶν, δεκάς δ' ἦν τῶνδε χωρὶς ἔκκριτος.

Herodotus, 8. 48, gives the total as 378. In Thucydides 1. 74 the number is given as 400. Herodotus, 8. 44, says that the Athenians furnished 180; but in 8. 1 he tells us that at Artemisium the Chalcidians manned 20 ships furnished by the Athenians, and Diodorus xv, 78 represents the Athenian contin-

gent as 200 at Salamis. More important, however, in considering this sentence in Demosthenes is Demosthenes' own statement *de Corona*, § 238, τριακοσίων οὐσῶν τῶν πασῶν, τὰς διακοσίας ἢ πόλιν παρέσχετο.

It will, I think, be admitted that the antithesis will be greatly improved by reading *τριακοσίαις* for *διακοσίαις* — 300 ships then from all Greece, 300 now from Athens alone—and, further, that it is incredible that Demosthenes, on such an occasion, would have irritated his audience by stating that they supplied only 100 ships. He would, however, wish to point the contrast as vigorously as he could, and we may therefore expect to find him here ignoring the 20 Athenian ships which were manned by Chalcidians at Artemisia, and stating that the Athenian contingent was 180, as Herodotus states. It is at least a curious coincidence that the numerical error, if error it be, can in both cases be easily accounted for; if we assume (i.) that τ' dropped out before τ of *τριήρεσι* and ε, the last letter of the preceding word, being supposed to conceal the required number, C' (for ε') was wrongly inserted to make good the deficiency, and (ii.) that π' was omitted before *παρεσχόμεθα*, we shall at once obtain what we require, οἶδε μὲν γε τ' (τριακοσίαις) τριήρεσιν ὧν ρ' π' (ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα) παρεσχόμεθ' ἡμεῖς. . . . Both of these possibilities appear to me to be highly probable.

J. R. WARDALE.

NOTE ON THE PARALLELISM BETWEEN THE *PROMETHEUS VINCTUS* OF AESCHYLUS AND THE *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES.

AN ancient critic says: 'If anyone thinks that Sophocles was a more perfect master of the tragic art than Aeschylus, no doubt he is right, but let him consider how much harder it was after Thespis and Phrynichus and Choerilus to raise tragedy to such a height than, writing after Aeschylus, to arrive at the perfection of Sophocles.'

This just criticism raises the question how far Sophocles was indebted to

Aeschylus for his conception and practice of the tragic art. He probably owed much more to his forerunner than Shakespeare did to Marlowe, though he did not eclipse him in anything like the same way. With the materials that time has left us it is impossible to trace the full extent of the debt, but a comparison of the *Prometheus* and the *Antigone* will throw some light upon it.

In the first place we find that the

very subject of the *Antigone* is based upon the facts to which Aeschylus in his *Septem c. Thebas* was apparently the first to give currency, that Creon by edict forbade the burial of Polyneices, and that Antigone resolved to defy the prohibition. The situation thus created is, however, treated by Sophocles in a manner totally different from that of Aeschylus. The Chorus in the *Antigone* do not support and uphold the heroine, nor do they rally round Creon. Still, Creon and Antigone correspond in conception closely with Zeus and Prometheus. In both cases the will of a superior and lawful sovereign has been set at nought, and in both the revolt is justified on the grounds of duty and humanity. Antigone is willing even to die that she may satisfy her conscience. She sacrifices her civic loyalty to keep the unwritten law of loyalty to her kin. Prometheus cannot die, but is ready to endure ages of anguish rather than surrender helpless mankind to the tyranny of Zeus. He will not give up his 'man-befriending ways' for all the enmity of the coterie of Gods.

Curiously enough there has been in respect to either play a divergence of opinion as to the real sentiments of the poet towards his protagonist. With regard to Prometheus, Shelley is the best-known exponent of the view that Aeschylus really sided with his hero, as he seems at first sight clearly to do, against Zeus, and meant us to consider the latter wholly wrong in the quarrel. So, on the other hand, there are some who hold that Sophocles wished us to look upon Antigone as the transgressor and Creon as acting within his rights. But surely the true view is the reverse in either case. Creon is wrong and Zeus is right. Indeed, the latter fact comes out quite clearly in the *Prometheus Freed*, but in the play which we have our feelings are wholly, and rightly, on the side of the Titan, who suffers for our sakes, and we rejoice in the tender sympathy of the Chorus for the champion of mankind.

The fault of Prometheus and of Antigone was the same (*αὐθαδία*), self-will, but self-will in a good and inspiring cause. They could both say: 'None but I alone resisted this decree' (P.V.

234). As Antigone is led away to execution, she cries: 'See what I suffer and at what men's hands for cherishing with reverent heart the reverend ordinances of Heaven!' (*Ant.* 942). So Prometheus, nailed to the rock, when left alone by his tormentors, calls, in almost identical terms, on the Elemental Powers: 'See what guerdon I, a God, from Gods have won!' (P.V. 92), and his last words, as he sinks into the depths of Tartarus, refer, like those of Antigone, to his unjust sufferings.

Much of the diction of the *Antigone* shows an acquaintance with the earlier play, e.g. ἀπιστεύειν = disobey (P.V. 640: *Ant.* 219); Σαλμυδησσός (P.V. 726: *Ant.* 970); ταγός = king (P.V. 96: *Ant.* 1057); κουφόνους (P.V. 383: *Ant.* 343, 617); ἐπίχειρα = guerdon (P.V. 319: *Ant.* 820); κατῶρυξ (P.V. 452: *Ant.* 774); ἄθλος = ordeal (P.V. 702, 752: *Ant.* 856); and ἐπαυτιῶμαι, the use of which in *Ant.* 490 points out the probable construction and reading in P.V. 674.

Similarities of construction abound in the two plays, such as, among others, πίπτουσι πτώματ' αἰσχρά (*Ant.* 1046: P.V. 919). Δράτω φρονεῖτω (*Ant.* 768) is an echo of δράτω κρατεῖτω (P.V. 937), and the curious asyndeton, καὶ ξυμμετίσχω καὶ φέρω τῆς αἰτίας (*Ant.* 937) is apparently modelled on πάντων μετασχῶν καὶ τετολμηκῶς ἐμοί (P.V. 331), and so supports the M.S. reading as against Jebb's emendation συντετολμηκῶς.

Noticeable, too, are the following resemblances:

λόγοι δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρρόθουν κακοί,
φύλαξ ἐλέγχων φύλακα (*Ant.* 259),

which exactly repeats the use of ἀλλήλοισιν and the loose construction of the nominative in P.V. 200.

Ζεὺς γὰρ μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους ὑπερεχθαίρει (*Ant.* 127, cp. 473), which shows traces of τῆς ἄγαν ὑψηγόρου γλώσσης (P.V. 318) and ὃς (sc. Ζεὺς) αὐτὸν ἐξέπληξε τῶν ὑψηγόρων κομπασμάτων (P.V. 360).

Even closer reminiscences are ἐπήβολος φρενῶν (*Ant.* 492: P.V. 446); μόχθος περισσός (P.V. 383), which becomes πόνος περισσός in *Ant.* 780; and ἔξω φέρομαι θεσμῶν, *Ant.* 802, with which compare P.V. 881.

Again, *πίτσας* (*Ant.* 652) reminds us of *ἀπέπτυσσα* (*P.V.* 1069); *τοῦτο ταύτη* (*Ant.* 722) is similar to *ταῦτα ταύτη* (*P.V.* 511); and the exclamatory accusative *σὲ δὴ, σὲ τὴν νεύουσαν* (*Ant.* 441) without a governing verb parallels the like construction in *P.V.* 944, *σὲ τὸν σοφιστὴν . . . τὸν πυρὸς κλέπτῃν λέγω*, where *λέγω* seems to have its common sense, 'I mean.'

From the above it will be seen that Sophocles in this case built partly on the foundations laid by Aeschylus, but that he here excelled the elder dramatist is by no means so clear. As a character, Prometheus wins our affection and admiration more than Antigone. The time-serving and self-satisfied Oceanus, set against his counterpart Ismene, will be found to be more vividly portrayed, though not so sympathetic a figure as the sister of Antigone. Creon is an inferior Zeus. He acts from a right motive, but having once taken up a wrong position, he refuses, with all the obstinacy of a weak nature, to give way until it is too late. One feels a little sorry for him. Zeus, on the other hand, though right in his quarrel with Prometheus, has been wrong in other matters, and has to render an account

to Powers that are above, and behind even Him. When He has made his peace with the Moirae, then Prometheus too must make his peace with Zeus, and wear the willow of contrition. Heracles is to be the intermediary between them; and, curiously enough, there is a vase extant which represents Heracles interceding with Creon for Haemon and Antigone (see Jebb, *Antigone, Introd.*, p. xl.).

The Chorus in the Prometheus show as much heroism as Antigone, and, at the last, dare the vengeance of Zeus himself rather than desert their kinsman when he and they are swallowed up by the earth. At the same time, though firm in their resolve, they are more womanly than the heroine of Sophocles, and have none of her self-consciousness or hardness. The stern, cold Antigone scarcely alludes to her lover, rebuffs her sister, and has a somewhat unseemly altercation with Creon. It is only when death is close upon her that her reserve breaks down and she turns to the Chorus for a sympathy which it is not in them to give her.

C. R. HAINES.

Mazagon, Godalming.

VARIA.

AESCHYLUS *Persae* 184. Atossa in her dream saw two female figures

μεγέθει τε τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα πολὺ
κάλλει τ' ἀμώμω.

τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα is only suitable to two real persons, *the tallest that now are*: it could not be used of unreal images in a dream, and those images standing for countries, not for persons. Read then *ἐκπρεπεστέρα*. In *Septem* 598 the MSS. vary between *δυσεβεστέροις* and *δυσεβεστάτοις*.

Lines 537-540 *πολλαί δ' . . . μετέχουσai* should be placed after 545. As they stand, *πολλαί* has nothing to refer to, while *αἱ δ' ἄβρόγοι Περσίδες* are introduced in 541 as though the *πολλαί* were quite different people. If it be said that the change would bring two

paroemiacs too close together, cf. *Agam.* 1340-2 and 1491-3.

* * *

Soph. *Fragm.* 787. The new moon

ἐξ ἀδήλου πρῶτον ἔρχεται νέα
πρόσωπα καλλύνουσα καὶ πληρούμενη,

and presently dwindles again *κάπὶ μηδὲν ἔρχεται*. Now it is true that Sophocles, like other Greek poets, is less careful than we are to avoid the recurrence of a word. But *ἔρχεται* twice in four lines is rather a blemish, and in the first of them *ἄρχεται* would be quite suitable. *ἄρχομαι* sometimes takes a participle, though I cannot quote an instance from Attic verse. Here perhaps the participles need not be joined quite closely with it.

In *O.T.* 814

εἰ δὲ τῷ ξένῳ
τούτῳ προσήκει Λαίου τι συγγενές

should we not read *προσήκει*? We should not say in English of a man long dead 'if he has anything to do with Laius' (long dead), and it can hardly be proper in Greek either.

* *

Aristoph. *Clouds* 470.

βουλομένους ἀνακοινοῦσθαί τε καὶ ἐς
λόγον ἐλθεῖν
πράγματα κἀντιγραφὰς πολλῶν ταλάν-
των
ἄξια σῇ φρενὶ συμβουλευσομένους μετὰ
σοῦ.

The construction of this is doubtful in one or two points. But in any case it would be improved by transposing the second and third lines, so as to join ἄξια with πράγματα.

* *

Hymn to *Aphrodite* 228

πολιαὶ κατέχυντο ἔθειραι
καλῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς εὐηγενέος τε γενείου.

Common sense requires *on*, not *from*, *his head*; not ἐκ, but κάκ.

* *

Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1604.

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ θοὸν ἵππον ἐς εὐρέα κύκλον
ἀγῶνος
στέλλη ὀρεξάμενος λασίης εὐπειθέα
χαίτης.

'Holding the docile creature by the mane' (Mooney). But ὀρέγομαι never means anything like *hold*, and ὀρέγομαι with an accusative is unnatural. No doubt Apollonius wrote *δραξάμενος*, constructing it with the accusative which we find in later Greek. In Plutarch's *Aemilius Paulus* 26 the old reading was *γονάτων ὀρεξάμενος*, but 'δραξάμενος R(eiske) et codex Zonarae 9, 23' says Sintonis.

In 1. 43 read ὀπλότατος for ὀπλότερος (cf. 157, 180, and on Aesch. *Pers.* above): 3. 613 the aorist *μειλίξαιτο* seems impossible for an unsuccessful attempt (*μειλίσσοιτο*?) : 3. 676 read *θευμορίη*.

* *

Babrius 10. 5. A slave-girl

πᾶσαν (or πᾶση) μάχην συνήπτειν οἰκο-
δεσποίνῃ.

For *πᾶσαν*, which is unsatisfactory, we might read *ἴσην*. 15. 11 runs ὁ δ' ἄλλος ὡς Βοιωτὸς οὐκ ἔχων ἴσην λόγοις ἄμιλλαν κ.τ.λ.

* *

Plutarch *Romulus* 5. Laurentia was shut up in the temple, ὡς δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔξοντος αὐτῇ. Probably εἰσιόντος αὐτῇ. ἔξ and εἰς are apt to get exchanged.

* *

Plato *Laus* 965A πότερον οὕτω λέγομεν ἢ πως ἄλλως δεῖν κατὰσκευ-
άζεσθαι (τὴν πόλιν); μὴν ὁμοίους πάντας
κεκτημένους καὶ μὴ διηκριβωμένους ἔστιν
οὗς κ.τ.λ.

For *κεκτημένους*, which is unmeaning, read *κεκτημένην*, comparing 964D τοιαύτην τινὰ φυλακὴν *κεκτημένην* ἐν αὐτῇ. It was assimilated in termination, as often happens, to the neighbouring words.

* *

Demosth. *de Cor.* 289. In the verses quoted I suggest that, adopting Weil's *πάτρας μὲν ἐκὰς σφετέρας* (as Blass did, though not Butcher), we should then transpose the second and third couplets. οὐνεκεν ἀλλήλων goes much more properly with ἀντιπάλων ὕβριν ἀπεσκέ-
δασαν than with 'Αἶδην κοινὸν ἔθεντο βραβῇ, while 'Αἶδην leads naturally to what is said in 7-8 of their dead bodies. οὐνεκεν Ἑλλήνων could not so well be brought near to *πάτρας ἔνεκα σφετέρας*, if we retained that reading, though it would not be impossible. In the present line 3 I feel no great difficulty about governing the genitive by βραβῇ.

F.L. 284 ὅτι τοῦτον εἶδεν ἀδικοῦντα. Would not ἦδειν be better?

Symmor. 24. *ὑπάρχειν* should, I think, be *ὑπάρξειν*. This kind of error is very frequent, and the future is more suitable. Nor need εἰς τότε mean *against that time*, for in expressions about the future εἰς constantly means *at some time*, e.g. in εἰσαυθις hereafter.

Leptines 36 πρὸς ὅσης κακίας ὑπερ-
βολὴν . . . προάγει. Rather ὅσῃν. τοσαύτη ὑπερβολή is common. In 55 should we insert (say) ἐφάνημεν after

ποιούντες? 125 πανουργότατον λόγον
for κακουργότατον?

Philippic I. 10 'λέγεται τι καινόν';
γένοιτ' ἂν τι καινότερον κ.τ.λ.; I do not
feel sure that we should not read λέγοιτ'

ἂν for γένοιτ' ἂν. The parts of γί-
γνομαι and λέγομαι certainly inter-
change; sometimes both appear as
various readings in MSS.

H. RICHARDS.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTERJECTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENTENCE.

I. In the following paper I propose to show that the fundamental type of sentence consists of a vocative and an imperative, that the vocative and imperative forms are primitive, and that they are derived from the interjection. If my attempt is successful, it will be necessary to revise and even to recast the traditional scheme of grammar.

The Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology presents in the clearest possible form the outlines of grammar as understood by English scholars of to-day. It has seemed best therefore to offer what I have to say, in the form of a criticism upon their report. It may save misunderstanding further if I admit that I do not regard language simply as an expression of thought but as an expression of the whole personality. This is really the main point at issue.

I have not been so unreasonable as to suppose that the committee were blind to the obvious facts with which I have to deal, and therefore I have tried to give them credit for an amount of sympathy which does not appear on the surface of their report. Perhaps the tone of my paper may seem offensive. The size of the committee must be my excuse. The virtues of a committee are usually in inverse ratio to its size.

When Horace asked the question: *ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?* he appealed to the example of the Roman teachers of Latin who, we are told, handed buns round in order to relieve the monotony of Latin grammar. Now although Horace uses the plural, *doctores*, it must be understood that the distribution of buns was made by the individual teacher and not by the Roman committee on *elementa prima*. When, therefore, Lucilius said: *gustavi crustula*

solus, we must suppose that he had a teacher all to himself. But laughter, as Sterne says, 'adds something to our fragment of life,' and is therefore better than a bun. If it is impossible to combine the statement of grammatical principles with amusement, I must throw up my hands, and confess that, on my interpretation of the facts of language, there is room for an occasional chuckle.

II. The current method of Latin grammar is based upon the logical analysis of written expression. I say Latin grammar, because in what follows we shall be mainly concerned with Latin. But this will not prevent us from getting light from Greek and English grammar, and to be quite candid from throwing a little light upon both English and Greek grammar. The reader may think this promise somewhat presumptuous, and, indeed, I should not have ventured upon it, if I had not felt that the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology in their report had not given sufficient place to language as expressing impulse and emotion. On p. 15 the decree goes forth 'that sentences be classified as follows in all the five languages: statements, questions, and the expressions of desire.' Exclamations are relegated to a note and are limited to a certain class of sentences: 'Those introduced by pronouns, adjectives, or adverbs, which in other contexts are either interrogative or relative, but are here exclamatory.'

However admirable the Latin grammar (as understood by the committee) may be, it does not cover the whole of the ground; it does not account adequately for the phenomena of *oral* expression. We are compelled therefore to go further afield, and in doing so we

light at once upon a considerable number of fresh facts. And these facts group themselves round the interjection. Quite independently of my preparations for this paper, I came across a striking passage in Tylor's *Primitive Culture* (I³, 176). 'The philologist's concern with [interjections] is to study their action in expressing emotion, and to trace their passage into more fully formed words.' The whole of Dr. Tylor's chapters on emotional and imitative language may be referred to as a foundation for the argument which follows.

We must begin by facing the question fairly: what is the object to which grammarians direct themselves? Do they mean written language or spoken language? To this I reply that all language properly so-called is to be regarded as spoken. It is only by an accident that it comes to be written. Language therefore is *oral* expression. And we should remind ourselves, on the one hand, that much oral expression is incapable of being reduced to writing, and, on the other hand, that much writing which passes for language is nothing of the kind.

III. But oral expression is only one form of human expression. A true workman expresses himself in his work, as do the engineers who keep our great steamships going, and so on. It throws the whole subject of grammar out of key if we confine ourselves to written language and to statements and questions which, as the committee say, correspond to logical judgments.

IV. I am glad that the committee referred to logical *judgments*. They are evidently conscious that grammar cannot be understood entirely from within itself. And in their wish to get help they have had recourse to psychology. For, although Kant has said that there is no such science as psychology, he has been confuted by the history of that science. And I am encouraged to fall back upon my own limited knowledge of psychology by the example of the committee. We shall not treat human beings therefore simply as giving rise to articulate sounds which can be reduced to order with the help of the logician. Now, since the majority of

the readers of the *Classical Review* are scarcely likely to know so much psychology as the committee, I will warn them of their danger lest they should fall into a dreadful heresy which is known as the 'faculty psychology.' By this is meant that one separates thought from feeling, and both from will; as though you could conduct your thoughts without being influenced by feelings, and *vice versâ*; or as though you could either think or feel or act without at the same time doing something of all three.

V. Now it is because the committee are unlikely to have fallen into so obvious a mistake that I venture to carry out what, I am sure, must have been their intention. In their report on Grammatical Terminology they omitted to say very much about the oral expression of feeling, not because they overlooked the facts which I have stumbled upon, but because it is very difficult to get a committee to agree upon everything, and they felt that if we regarded grammar as mainly an exercise in the logical judgment, it was at least something. Most practical grammarians are uncomfortable in the presence of feeling and action; and after trying to make room in my own case for the expression of feeling and action, I am inclined to sympathise.

VI. At the same time we must not shrink from following out this topic somewhat further. If we are to be complete grammarians, we must study in a little detail the behaviour of human beings, so that we may understand the manner in which their behaviour finds expression in language. In particular, what is the stage at which man, as a matter of course, employs statements and questions which, as the committee says, correspond to logical judgments? This high estimate which the committee entertains of the human intellect came as somewhat of a shock to me, because I had always understood that by nature man was imperfectly equipped with reason, and that the use of Latin grammar in education was to supply this imperfection in the work of the Creator. Monsieur Anatole France has expressed a similar thought in his own incom-

parable way. He is looking back to the good old times. 'By learning Latin the pupils learnt something infinitely more precious than Latin. They learnt the art of directing and expressing their thought.' Now, although I cannot claim to have entered into the full possession of this heritage, it is obviously necessary that we should find a place in our scheme of human behaviour for that delightful attitude of mind which, owing to their study of Latin, the committee shares with Monsieur France. This we will call the attitude of *understanding*, expressed in statements and questions which correspond to logical judgments.

VII. But what is the typical attitude or attitudes of the great mass of mankind, including the skilful engineer and myself? At any rate we can use things for our own ends, even if we cannot reflect upon them very clearly. The engineer's vocabulary would perhaps illustrate the subject of this paper with more emphasis than would suit the pages of the report on Grammatical Terminology. But this could at least be said about him: he would be perfectly sincere. There would be no affectation of making statements which correspond to logical judgments. Without going into unnecessary detail, many engineers use interjections, vocatives, imperatives and other exclamations in the most vivid way. This is the primitive attitude of man contending with his surroundings and using such tools as come to hand. We can all reach, or pass through, this attitude. Hence we can now proceed to mark off two attitudes of man—first, that of *practice* or *use*; second, that of *understanding*.

VIII. It is difficult to make some people (especially those scientific men who have learnt Latin) understand that there is an experience higher than the formation of logical judgments. Mankind cannot be dismissed offhand into two classes: those who have learnt 'the art of directing and expressing their thought,' and those less fortunate ones who have not so learnt. There is a third attitude of man to other persons and things—namely, the attitude of *sympathy*. We no longer contemplate things and persons from the outside; we enter into their intentions and tendencies. Now it

is quite possible to be deeply sympathetic, and yet to fail of that logical perfection towards which we are conducted by Latin grammar. Dr. Fennell, in his excellent edition of Pindar's *Odes*, was perplexed by the style of the poet, and delivered himself as follows: 'Most of the difficulties in Pindar's *Odes* arise from his rapidity and fulness of thought, which often seems to have made him sacrifice the formal expression of the connexion of his ideas.' This statement is not altogether clear, but I understand it to mean that Pindar's attitude to life was not one of calm understanding. For no state of mere understanding would make us 'sacrifice the formal expression of the connexion of our ideas.' On the contrary, where you have perfect understanding 'all is ordered luminous, simple.' I am quoting Monsieur France on Livy. 'Livy is not a profound genius; but he is a perfect pedagogue. He never moves us, and for that reason we read him without any keen pleasure. But how regularly he thinks! How pleased he is to show his thought, to examine all the pieces of it, and to explain the part which each of them plays!' I said to myself when I read this passage: 'There is a description of the committee on Grammatical Terminology.' At the same time, among the members of that committee, I recognise the names of several friends of mine whose knowledge of Pindar is much greater than any to which I can myself aspire. They are in the committee, but not entirely of it. They show that it is possible not only to utter sentences and questions which correspond to logical judgments, but to penetrate further into the heart of things, and to unveil the hidden things of the classical literatures. Neither understanding nor the absence of understanding is the key to this third form of apprehension, but a heart that vibrates in response to the eternal voices. At any rate, I can count upon their assent to the very modest proposition which I will lay down now as the main thesis of this paper: *the analysis of language from a logical standpoint does not account for all the forms of which grammar must take account*. Or, in other words, oral expression is organically related not only to thought, but to action and feeling.

IX. Some one may say, however, that the committee have made adequate provision for the expression of feeling, on p. 15, in their third category of *desire*. But for some reason or other they are careful to distinguish sentences expressing desire from exclamations, and therefore from the expression of feeling. I will confess that I do not understand the point of view of the committee. Surely the expression of desire involves the expression of feeling! Desires, we are told, include commands, requests, entreaties, wishes. From this it would appear that desires roughly answer to the use of the imperative mood. And this is the sense in which I shall take leave to understand the expression of desire. From our point of view we shall regard the imperative mood as an ejaculation, no less than the fourth form of sentence which is so regarded by the committee.

Curiously enough if we examine the exclamations which the committee separate from the other forms of sentence, they will be found to consist at the root in *nouns* used as ejaculations. *Que de fleurs! what nonsense! ὦ βάθος πλούτου κ.τ.λ.* There is reason to think that the verb in such phrases as *Ut perii* is no real exception. We may compare the phrase with *O me miserum!*

X. Now if we combine the imperative mood with the vocative, which is the simplest form of the noun used in ejaculations (that is, if we combine the committees 'expressions of desire' with their 'exclamation'), we arrive at a well-defined form of sentence: *Ave, Caesar; Lugete, o Veneres Cupidinesque; Quaere novum vatem, tenerorum mater amorum.* In English we have: *Blow, blow, thou winter wind; Go, lovely rose; Ruin seize thee, ruthless king; and so on.* Such sentences are the proper expression of feeling and action. They are specially characteristic of everyday life. Anyone can satisfy himself of this by listening to the passers-by.

But I do not think it has been observed that this type of sentence is frequent enough in literature to demand special attention. I open by chance, *Every Man in his Humour*. The first words of the dialogue are:

A goodly day toward! and a fresh morning!
Brainworm,
Call up young master. Bid him rise, Sir;
Tell him I have some business to employ him.

Two interjections and then two sentences that begin the action of the play. Take a case where such sentences interrupt the current of ordinary statements. How beautifully, in the parabasis of the *Knights*, two such sentences occur! the prayers to Poseidon and Athena. We want a name for this sort of sentence. Perhaps the term *active* is as good as we can find. Such a sentence is more than a bare imperative: it is more than a bare vocative. There must be the combination of the noun and the verb. If we wanted a technical description, perhaps the term *judgment* would be convenient. Unfortunately the term judgment has been confined by the grammarians and logicians and psychologists to something which is not so much a judgment, as a theoretic opinion.

For to judge is more than to hold an opinion. When we judge we express both our feeling towards an event or person, and the demand which arises out of such a feeling.

We are prepared now to meet a striking fact. The Lord's Prayer is *exclusively* composed of active sentences or judgments. It begins with a vocative which is understood along with all the succeeding expressions of desire. In like manner the National Anthem illustrates throughout the type of sentence with which we are occupied.

In the distinction which we have thus established between the active and the theoretic sentences, we secure a touchstone of style. Of course, now that the distinction has been pointed out the writers of prize poems will doubtless take account of it. But it is interesting to thread one's way through the jungle of English hymns with this as a clue. Most of our fine hymns begin with an active sentence. Where, however, the first sentence is of the narrative form, the effect is rarely tolerable, unless the verb is one of prayer or praise. I cannot refrain from one instance of an obvious failure. The congregation is addressing God, and they begin with the tame state-

ment of the time: *The day is past and over!* I should like to think that a similar line of inquiry may lead, in the hands of abler critics, to important results in the classical literatures.

XI. I do not wish to pride myself unduly upon the discovery which was announced in the last paragraph. For the committee on Grammatical Terminology were only prevented from making it by their admirable but excessive devotion to the philosophy of Aristotle. They recommend on p. 8, 'that the first stage in the analysis of a sentence be to divide it into two parts, to be called the subject and the predicate.' For example: *The merciful man is merciful to his beast.* Here *is merciful to his beast* is the predicate and *the merciful man* is the subject. Now in the philosophy of Aristotle, the subject is regarded as the substrate of qualities, and the predicate is attached to this substrate. Aristotle frequently employs another turn of phrase. He says τὸ β ὑπάρχει τῷ α as well as τὸ α ἔστι τὸ β. If we paraphrase our typical sentence it will run: *The quality of being merciful to his beast pertains to the merciful man.* In other words, the analysis of the sentence into subject and predicate turns upon the Aristotelian conception of substance. Hence, what the committee speaks of as a sentence (p. 8) is really a theoretic opinion expressed in the form of Aristotelian logic. If only the committee could have shaken off the trammels of logic! Let the reader compare the beginning of my tenth section with the contents of the preceding section; he will see that I rightly acknowledged my indebtedness to p. 15 of the report. The committee describe Statements and Questions indeed in accordance with the rules of Aristotle (compare p. 8). But when they are left to themselves they describe Desires and Exclamations in such a way, that we only needed to combine the two in order to obtain the judgment proper or active sentence.

XII. We are now going to take the *active sentence* as the type to which other forms of sentence may be referred. We begin by discarding the term *subject* from grammar. There is no useful

office performed by this word, which cannot be rendered by the term *person*. The *subject* of the verb is the *person* of the verb. And, if you say that a person is not a thing, and therefore it is ridiculous to describe gold as a person in the phrase *gold glitters*, I reply that gold is a person, just as much as *it*, in *it glitters*, is the third person. But, further, gold is masculine in Greek and French; French can say of gold, *il brille*. Our use of the word *person*, therefore, answers to the fact of gender, and is more appropriate to the genius of language than the philosophical term *substrate*. In English we have still the *ship* to remind us of the time when gender applied to English nouns. In other words, *person* throws us back upon the time when all language palpitated with life.

XIII. The term *predicate* must be dismissed along with the term *subject*. For we are told by the committee, on page 8, that sentences are to be analysed into subject and predicate. Strictly speaking, the term predicate κατηγορούμενον should be limited to *assertions*. Hence expressions of desire scarcely admit of predicates in the proper sense. What, for example, is the predicate in *Long live the King?* The committee answers, *Long live*. But this is not merely asserted, it is commanded, or prayed for. I shall not labour this point further, but shall go on to the fourth form of sentence—exclamations. *How true! Que de fleurs!* We are told that the adverbs are exclamatory. In that case we have a phrase consisting of an exclamation and a nominal form. Here then, at any rate, there is no predicate.

Let us turn back to the active sentence. This consists of a vocative and a verb, or, as we may now say, a person and a verb. Does the *verb* supply us with the term we want. I think it does. The verb denotes movement and change, together with their contradictories. Even in the verbs that express rest, the rest is not static but dynamic. For example, the verb *to be* is completed in some language from the verb *to stand*, and the standing implies standing firm, that is, against resistance.

In a word, the active sentence refers action and reaction to a personal agent. The term predicate implies the bare addition of a label to an imperfectly developed object of thought. Hence the active sentence is infinitely more frequent in daily life than the logical sentence.

XIV. We have thus seen reason to lay down another type of sentence than that to which the distinction of subject and predicate applies. The active sentence answers to the language of common life as distinguished from the language of reflection. For this latter the logical sentence is appropriate. Unfortunately the grammarians have tried to reduce the active sentence to this latter type. In so doing they have not only distorted the language of ordinary busy life: they have failed to do justice to the language of sympathy and the deeper emotions generally.

XV. This will involve a recasting of grammar in order to make it correspond more closely to the order of facts. I will conclude by a brief summary of the lines along which the grammar, first of the interjection, second of the verb, and then of the noun, requires to be reconsidered.

XVI. The interjection will come first in our grammar. Do you remember how in Rudyard Kipling's story, *The Man Who Was*, the returned officer was recognised by the vowel sound upon which his weeping was pitched? This may serve as a parable for us. There is a profounder vernacular than that of articulate language. Man weeps, laughs, snores, wonders, rejoices.

Nor is the menagerie silent. Our own *cockadoodledoo* does not correspond to life so closely as the *co co co co* of Petronius, nor is *baa baa black sheep* so realistic as the *be be* of Greek literature.

XVII. Then will come the parts of speech which are nearest to the interjection. In the verb we must follow the example of Mr. Magnus in the *Pickwick Papers*, and conjugate ourselves into the imperative mood. There is considerable evidence that this was a primitive form. *Lauda, mone, rege, audi* are both the stems of verbs and the second singular of the imperative. *Vel* falls into its place as the imperative

of *volo*. Compare the derivation of *if* from *gif*. The analogy of *vel* supports this derivation. *Dic, duc, fac, fer* help us to understand *vel*; the lack of the terminal vowel is due to the indeterminate character of the vowel which follows the stem in the third conjugation.

XVIII. The subjunctive is to be treated first as an ally of the imperative and ultimately of the interjection. *Benedicite* is paralleled by *benedicamus*. Where are we to draw the line as we conjugate *faciam, fac, faciat, faciamus, facite, faciant*? It is at this point, therefore, that the subjunctive must first enter our grammatical scheme. We must correct Roby therefore. 'The subjunctive mood,' he says, 'as distinguished from the indicative, expresses an action as thought or supposed, rather than as done or narrated.' The subjunctive is nearer than the indicative to the command, the interjection. It emphasises the will, the desire. Hence we contrast it as doing something, with the indicative which is the narrating of something. Nor can I accept without qualification the report on the *Terminology of Grammar*, xlii. The reference of the subjunctive to future time is only secondary; this reference arises from the imperative meaning which as we have seen, may be treated as primary. The committees quote the question: *quid faciam*? the reply should be *hoc age*. Certainly it would not run *hoc agere te oportebit*. The footnote of the committee is unfortunately phrased. The reference to the future is not intrinsic, but adventitious.

XIX. If we consider the example just given, we can see how the deliberative subjunctive arises out of the imperative. And from the deliberative there may come the use of the subjunctive in indirect questions. *Quid ab hac metuis? Quid ego metuam, rogitas*. 'Do you inquire what I am to fear?' We might regard this indirect question as an independent clause, and compare the whole phrase with such constructions as *quid mihi dicent, demiror* (Ter. Ph. 234).

XX. The beginnings of the final construction may be seen in such collocations as *cura valeas*. Such constructions are obviously to be treated as primary, and are not to be explained

by the omission of *ut*. They may be compared with phrases like *iures postulo*. The misunderstanding of these constructions is due to the undue postponement of the imperative in the scheme of grammar.

In the limits of this paper I can only suggest the derivation of the deliberative and the final subjunctive from the imperative. The reader can consider for himself how the subjunctive after relative pronouns and adverbs, and also the subjunctive in reported speech, may be traced back to the imperative. English will furnish a clue. Our own indirect speech shows relations with the imperative. Dr. Johnson is perplexed by the use of *should be* in reported speech, and quotes Bacon: 'There is a fabulous narration, that in the northern countries there *should be* an herb that groweth in the likeness of a lamb.' Compare an idiom still current: He is one who *should* know. *Est qui sciat*.

XXI. Turning to the noun, we shall at once be led to the vocative as the typical interjectional case, and as the nearest to the primitive form. Like the imperative, the vocative (where

there is a form separate from the nominative) contains the stem. This is seen more clearly in Greek. Owing to the importance of the vocative, both actually in speaking and historically, it would seem appropriate to put it before the nominative.

XXII. The interjectional use of the dative is seen in phrases like *quid mihi Celsus agit?* Now it is probable that the case endings of personal pronouns are older than other case endings. Hence we will venture to argue from the form of *mihi*. The ending *-hi* is probably implosive—that is to say, a gasp. The whole group of endings, *-hi*, *-bi*, in Latin, and *-φι* in Greek, may be compared with the interjection, *hie*, and its cognates (cf. Sweet, *History of Language*, p. 35). It is tempting to imagine that the *i* which is common to all dative singulars in Latin was developed by analogy from *mihi*.

XXIII. I have offered these few illustrations of my main thesis, because they are fairly certain. To have gone further would unduly lengthen this paper.

FRANK GRANGER.

NOTES

THEOCRITUS, IDYLL XV. 112.

MSS.: *πὰρ μὲν οἱ ὄρια κεῖται, ὅσα δρυὸς ἄκρα φέροντι*. Meineke points out that *μὲν οἱ* is unmetrical, as the digammated *Φοι* should lengthen *μὲν* by position, cp. 25. 82. His own suggestion *ὁπώρα* is, however, hardly convincing. Perhaps the original reading was—*πὰρ μὲν ὅσ' ὄρια κεῖται, ὅσα δρυὸς ἄκρα φέροντι*, 'Beside him lie the season's fruits, even all that the oak-sprays bear.' For the use of *ὅσος* as correlative to *ὅσος*, cp. *Idyll* IV. 39, *ὅσον αἰγες ἐμὴν φίλαι, ὅσσον ἀπέσβας*; Oppian *Cyneg.* 4. 210 *ὅσον χάδον ὅσσον ἔρεξαν*. The letter change in uncials is of course slight, and might arise through misunderstanding of the idiom.

R. J. SHACKLE.

Marlborough College, Wilts.

TERENCE, EUNUCHUS, 835-839.

PYTHIAS. Habemus hominem ipsum. THAIS.

Ubi est? PY. Em, ad sinisteram.

Viden? TH. Video. PY. Comprendi iube, quantum potest.

TH. Quid illo faciemus, stulta? PY. Quid facias rogas?

Vide amabo, si non, quom aspicias, os impudens Videtur! TH. Non est? PY. Tum quae eius confidentiast!

So these lines are given in Tyrrell's texts. L. 839 is the crux. The MSS. vary in attributing the *non est* either to Thais or to Pythias. For *non est tum* Fleckeisen and Wagner read *tum autem*, which has the merit of meaning something at least. But there is a well-defined type of comic sentence which can easily be extricated from beneath the débris of *non est tum*. Fabia quotes two examples in his note—

Quom faciem videas, videtur esse quantivis preti (Ter. *Andr.* 856).

At facies quom adspicias eorum, haud mali videtur (Plaut. *Pseud.* 111).

On the analogy of these it is plain that we must construe *quom aspicias os impudens* together, and that the predicate of *videtur* is to seek.

Next, *quae eius confidentiast* is the regular idiom for 'such is his assurance,' or 'to judge by his assurance.' Whether taken in this sense or as an exclamation, the words give a healthy and complete meaning.

The problem then is simple and definite: to find under *non est tum* the missing predicate of *videtur*. The answer leaps out at you when you put the question straight. Read—

vide amabo si non, cum aspicias os impudens, videtur *monstrum*, quae eius confidentiast.

The word occurs in 656, 696, 860, always of the real eunuch, or to express the uncanny precocity of Chaerea's gallantries (aged sixteen). Pythias' extreme uneasiness (in the next scene) at the idea of Thais being left alone Chaerea is the best commentary on *monstrum*.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

HORACE, *EPISTLES*, II. i. 113-117.

nauem agere ignarus naus timet; abrotonum aegro

non audet nisi qui didicit dare; quod medicorum est

promittunt medici; tractant fabrilia fabri: scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.

BENTLEY's objection to the tautology of bringing in the physician by name after he has already been brought in by figure has been felt by subsequent critics. *Nihil mutandum est*, says Orelli, *etiamsi haec repetitio laudari vix potest*.

A fault of taste is more improbable in the Second Book of the *Epistles* than anywhere in Horace. But, besides the point of taste, there is the further difficulty of *promittunt*. Kiessling coolly asserts that '*promittere*, like *profiteri*, is the proper word for a professional engagement.' The assertion seems to rest solely on Porphyrios' note *promittunt: profitentur*. No other instances are cited.

Nor is the force of Bentley's critical objection weakened by the inadequacy of his proposed substitute—

quod melicorum est
promittunt melici,

which (it has been generally agreed) would mean not musicians, but lyric poets.

A change, palaeographically as slight as Bentley's suggestion, would be to read—

quod modicorum est
promittunt modici.

I.e., 'small folks only make themselves liable for what [such amounts as] small folks can raise.'

This certainly gives a normal meaning to *promittunt* (*e.g.* *Ep.* II. ii. 10). The use of *modicus* would seem to be warranted by Juv. v. 108, *modicis quae mittebantur amicis*. Tacitus has *pecuniae modicus* (*Ann.* iii. 72). And the general train of the argument would run: 'In all other departments of life people know their limitations; a man knows he cannot exercise a profession in which he is not qualified, or undertake responsibilities beyond his means, or handle the tools of a trade without being skilled in the trade. But poetry is the business where any amateur can can rush in.'

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

REVIEWS

STUDIES IN THE ODYSSEY.

Studies in the Odyssey. By J. A. K. THOMSON, M.A. Pp. xii + 250. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " × 6". Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. 7s. 6d. net.

RECENT German studies in the saga, coupled with the most unhappy thought of Expurgation, led Prof. Murray to his traditional-book theory of the rise of the Greek epic. His work dealt chiefly with the *Iliad*. The *Odyssey*, which proved less amenable to treatment, is now considered by Mr. Thomson from the same point of view.

The argument is conveniently summarised in the Preface. Odysseus is in origin an 'Eniautos - Daimon' and belongs to Boeotia, which here means Central Greece. He migrated thence with the Minyans to Arcadia, Elis and the Ionian Islands. At Mantinea he was married to the Water-fowl divinity, Penelopé. Boeotian and Arcadian *Odysseys* can be reconstructed. The epos is Ionian, but it was Achæanised at a certain stage. There is a new answer to the question, who were the Achæans? "*Ομηρος* was a functional name. Homer is a double of Apollo in his capacity of Aoidos.

It is all admittedly very new and very startling, and the scheme bristles with difficulties which require much arguing down. It is of course impossible to review it in detail here, but one item in the proof, the fundamental position of the Boeotian origin of the Eniautos-Daimon—yet another *Wesen* for the *πολύτροπος* hero!—may be taken as a sample. The hero's grandfather Autolykos is Very Wolf, and Odysseus himself is Wolf, and there was a wolf-god on Parnassus, Autolykos' home, (and no doubt on many another jungle-covered hill in Central Greece in Minyan days), and 'the shadow of Parnassus falls across the Boeotian plain.' Autolykos is a double of Hermes, and Odysseus much the same. Difficulties here are brushed aside. One is that the Parnassus cult was connected with Apollo Lykoreus and not with Hermes. But

that is a trifle. 'The cult was *almost certainly* in existence before it was *taken over* by Apollo.' A still graver objection is the philological. It is far from certain that *Αὐτόλυκος* = Very-Wolf (Sieck, Vürtheim and Menrad, for instance, give *ipsa lux*), and the odds against the derivation of *Ὀδυσσεύς* from the stem of *λύκος*, a wolf, are very great indeed. But the etymology that suits is selected in another characteristic sentence. 'The stem of *Ὀλυσσεύς* is *apparently* luk, which is the stem of lukos, and so Autolykos gives his grandson his own name. Olyseus and Autolykos are *therefore apparently* only two *slightly* varying names for the same god or hero named of the wolf.' One has to hack one's way through, as the Germans say, and to disregard philological scraps of paper. But when Mr. Thomson admits, in a later section, that 'in philological matters above all others what is not certain is so very likely to be wrong,' he will not blame us, with so many alternatives to choose from, if we reject this new Wolfian theory altogether. It is supported *inter alia* by reference to Arkesilaos as a family name in the Ithacan genealogical tree, but we should require proof that the name of Odysseus' other grandfather, Arkeisios, to whom a new and exaggerated importance is now assigned, is short for Arkesilaos (why not for Arkesidemos or Arkesi—something else?), and that Lykos and the like are really wolfish in signification. Usener thought the latter idea a mere 'juggle of popular etymology,' and, if Fick's judgment that '*Ἀρκείσιος* is a *Kosenamen*' is by itself final, then his '*Ὀδυσσεύς* from '*Ὀδυσσίλαος* (the very reverse, by the way, of '*Ἀρκεσίλαος*) is final too, and fatal to Mr. Thomson. In asserting, *simplement*, that the later degraded view of Odysseus' character was of the primitive tradition, and that the *Nekyia* is the oldest part of the *Odyssey*, he is only defying authority without helping his case.

So the basis of the scheme is, to say

the least, shaky. For the rest, the question must be, what *evidence* is there that the poem was evolved as a traditional book? The chapters devoted to the enucleation of Boeotian and Arcadian *Odysseys* raise hopes, but are disappointing. They deal with the saga, the *Vorgeschichte* to the epic; for poems and Minyan bards the demonstration is futile. By what right can anyone assume an 'Argo *epic*' before the beginnings of the *Odyssey*? The language reflects the confusion, so common in recent Homerology, between epos and saga. Now it is 'the poem of Odysseus' that the Minyans take with them on their wanderings, again it is the 'saga of Odysseus' that is modified by the prestige of the Achaeans, and we are finally assured that, in the discussion of the Boeotian kernel, Mr. Thomson is 'merely arguing for the existence of a Boeotian stratum in the legends of Odysseus,' and that is hardly worth quarrelling about. The admission that later developments have coloured and transformed this *Kern* does not of course make the enucleation easier. It would make many enquirers renounce the project in despair of convincing anybody.

The general method displays the weaknesses so often remarked in the works of certain schools in Germany and in this country. The evidential value of obscure religious phenomena or of small hints and happenings in story and legend is unduly exaggerated, and the proof is often one-sided. The saga, always imitative, reproductive and assimilative, and developing different traits in different regions, has left a record so extraordinarily rich, confused and contrarious, that a judiciously eclectic process can make out from it a case for any preconceived idea. If we wish for our argument to prove that Odysseus had an aversion to the horse, the materials are to hand; if we wish to prove his special interest in the quadruped, there is no difficulty. We can use Leukothea's intervention on the hero's behalf as evidence of his Boeotian origin; we can use it to prove quite a different one. If Penelopé has to be proved divine, the scandal that she was the mother of Pan is resusci-

tated, and all the other mothers enumerated by the mythologists are excluded in a staggering sentence—'always, except in one text' (easily disposed of) 'his mother is Penelopé.' If we require to claim for the Argo-saga prior possession of the spring Artakié, we assert borrowing by the *Odyssey*, ignoring considerations which tell against it. Order of development in time and place is just as one wishes to see it. The saga is the happiest of hunting grounds for any one with a theory.

The author's great ability and dexterity in argument are evident on every page, but the method of investigation makes openings for objection equally numerous. He has made a very readable, but very unconvincing, book. The style is clear and terse, but the tone much too dogmatic. Gaps in the reasoning have to be filled in with phrases which mark the hiatus. There is a commendable independence of old critical fads. Mr. Thomson's rejection, for example, of the views of the Hermes of the Hymn and of the same god as *Psychopompos*, which are cherished so widely simply because they are products of German *Kultur*, shows that his Homeric heart is sometimes in the right place. But for his main thesis we want evidence about the *poem*. As was once said of Homeric happy thoughts, *einen Gedanken ausfinden ist Spiel, ihn ausdenken Arbeit*. The 'work' in the present case has still to be done. One example of a great poem that grew from germ to maturity as a traditional book would be worth all the laboured speculations in these *Studies* and in the *Rise of the Greek Epic*. Andrew Lang knew of none such in literary history. A *Shāh-nāma* and a *Kalewala* are worlds away; the Pentateuch and magic herbals are not even in point. To Lang the doctrine of Expurgation, which Mr. Thomson embraces, though not, it may be suggested, with great enthusiasm, was the corner-stone of the new structure, and the only evidential matter worth regarding. He easily discredited it; an examination of the instances adduced can show that it has no basis in fact. But that is another story, to be told elsewhere. A. SHEWAN.

MISSON'S MONOGRAPH ON LIBANIUS.

Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios.
 Par J. Misson, S.J. Large octavo.
 Pp. xvi+160. Louvain: Bureaux du
 Recueil; or, Paris: Picardet Fils,
 1914. Fr. 5.

THE Hellenists, who in the fourth Christian century were suddenly confronted with the Emperor Julian's restoration of the pagan cults, had to decide each for himself how far he would follow the lead of that uncompromising fanatic. Theurgists, like Maximus, attached themselves to his person, and were sure of support; a few philosophers, like Themistius, held aloof, whether from caution or intellectual arrogance; and Julian was, of course, at once surrounded by a crowd of flatterers whose zeal was of all shades of sincerity. But there was another group of men who were deeply interested in his religious revival, though they may not have sympathised with all his beliefs or methods. These were the educated conservative pagans who had preserved in their families the traditional worship of the gods. They had not been persecuted by Constantine and Constantius, partly because they were discreet, partly because they were useful for writing panegyrics, and partly because to attack them would not have been a popular move. Such a man was Libanius, the famous rhetorician of Antioch, who possessed the greatest influence in his native city, solely on account of his persuasive eloquence and personal charm. Long after the collapse of Julian's revival he maintained his position and his school, and though he had to suffer many petty annoyances from which Julian would have protected him, he still wrote the imperial panegyrics that no Emperor could do without, adjusted strikes, and taught Greek letters to his Syrian, Armenian, Thracian, and Arab pupils. If he complains it is mainly because, like all Greek professors, he had to see practical studies such as Roman law gradually ousting the study of Greek literature, which meant that the literary declamation and the school of rhetoric would soon cease to exist.

To define the religious convictions of such a man is not easy. M. Misson has carefully tabulated his references to *ὁ θεός* and *οἱ θεοί*, to the solar deities, to prayer, the Mysteries, and so forth. From these it appears that Libanius did not lean to monotheism, and that he means precisely the same thing, whether he refers to the gods in the singular or the plural; that in all the events, good and bad of his own career, he saw the intervention of *Τύχη*, the all-pervading, and though he does not assign to her creative or demiurgic powers, she possesses all the other attributes of the most powerful gods. Though he was free from the grosser superstitions and belief in prodigies that swayed Julian, he had a blind belief in dreams. The poets are for him inspired authors, and he did not trouble himself with physical interpretations of the myths as Julian did. Nor did he, like Julian, make Helios-Mithras the supreme god, though there are numerous invocations to Helios in his speeches. For the evidence of his genuine piety M. Misson relies mainly on the brief invocations to the gods that escape from him in the speeches and letters—if, indeed, anything can be said to escape from so accomplished a rhetorician. But in defining the religion of a literary man who was the slave of the conventions of rhetoric it is easier to say what he was not, and on this head M. Misson might have said more with advantage. Libanius was not a missionary eager to make converts, nor a Neo-Platonic philosopher, a fact which saved him from the temptation to theurgy which dogged the Neo-Platonists of his day. Above all he betrays no sympathy with the impassioned revivalism fostered by Julian. In fact, between his religious faith and Julian's we see all the contrasts that we should expect to find between the convert who cannot rest till he has converted everybody else, and the man who has inherited his religion from his ancestors. Julian does not seem to have been dissatisfied with Libanius on the score of enthusiasm. He knew that the schools of rhetoric

were the real stronghold of paganism, and that men like Libanius, who believed that Greek culture and rhetoric must perish if the Christians should triumph, were his most sincere supporters. Libanius always took for granted that the Christians were barbarians, whose religion shut them out from Hellenic philosophy and culture. This was not true, as was shown by their dismay when Julian issued his edict forbidding the teaching of classical literature by the Christians. The latter, in fact, had never attempted to overthrow the educational tradition, or to train their pupils by means of the Scriptures. They returned to the classics with renewed ardour, when the Christian Valentinian rescinded the edict. Another striking difference between Julian and Libanius is that the latter shows no interest in Julian's earnest attempt to persuade the Hellenists, and especially the priests, that to regain their hold on the common people they must emulate the works of charity and the pure morals of the best Christians. In the old-fashioned sense of the word he was more orthodox than Julian, more

conservative, and he would not have welcomed Jehovah to the company of the gods as Julian hastened to do. He was an intellectual aristocrat, who took no more trouble to understand Christianity than an intellectual to-day would take to understand a new religion. The composition of a declamation embroidered with the proper commonplaces from Greek literature, and the applause of his audience, were more to him than all Julian's moral exhortations and sacrifices to the gods. No doubt he would have preferred, like Ammianus, that his Emperor should be *sacrorum legitimus observator*.

M. Misson's monograph, and the dissertations on Libanius that are beginning to appear, are signs of the renewed interest in his works due to Foerster's edition, which has made Libanius accessible to the student. During the whole nineteenth century he had been unread and practically buried in Reiske's eighteenth-century edition.

WILMER CAVE WRIGHT.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

THE GREEK DIMINUTIVE SUFFIX -ισκο- -ισκη-.

The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ισκο- -ισκη-.

By WALTER PETERSEN. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press. 1913.

THE first few pages of this exhaustive investigation deal with the distribution of the suffix -isco- in the different Indo-Germanic languages. Whereas it is common in Greek, in Latin there are only three examples. The suffix may be analysed into -is-, weak grade of the comparative suffix -jes- -jos, with the common -ko- suffix as the second element. -isco- might originally be used to form both adjectives and nouns; in Greek it has become specialised as a nominal suffix. It is found in all periods of the Greek language, though it is entirely absent from Aeolic (and probably on this account from Homer also). The accent falls regularly on the first

syllable of the suffix, though this has a short *ι*; the author ascribes this as being due to the influence of the feminine (-ισκη) and cases of the masculine which end in a long vowel or diphthong. The gender of derivatives in -ισκο- is the same as that of their primitives. We are next introduced to the different meanings of the suffix, (a) similarity or approximate identity, (b) deteriorative, (c) diminutive, (d) hypocoristic, (e) proper names. Each of these classes is again subdivided into 'congeneric groups.' On the whole this subdivision has been well done, though occasionally it would appear to be somewhat fanciful, see especially § 62 and §§ 102, 103. Before dealing with the proper names, the author sums up as follows: 'Apparent cases of all meanings except diminutive uses and the designation of similarity are later than the Classical period, and

never were consciously attributed to the suffix. Words which seem to show these meanings are all due to congeneric attraction or to the substitution of -ισκο- for -ιον because of the general feeling of equivalence of the two suffixes.'

The chapter on the proper names is particularly interesting and offers scope for some criticism. We think § 105 should have been placed earlier and considerably extended. We feel convinced that the proper name 'Ανδρίσκος is to be regarded as a short-name ('Kosename') from 'Ανδροκράτης, etc., and is not a diminutive of ἀνήρ, meaning 'manikin.' The same applies to Μενίσκος from Μενέξενος, etc., not from Μένων, Ποδίσκος from Ποδάρκης, etc., not from Ποδῆς. We think this principle should have been applied much more widely than it has been. We should not have had Λυκίσκος first explained as derived from λύκος with an idea of similarity to the primitive, and only five pages later discover the right (as we believe) explanation—namely, that it is a short-name from a compound like Λυκοῦργος; similarly with Μηνίσκος (not 'like the moon,' but from Μηνόδοτος, etc.), Πατρίσκος (not 'little father,' but from Πατροκλῆς, etc.). We do not believe that Μενίσκος on the Thessalian inscription quoted (p. 194) meant 'son of Μένων' or 'little Μένων,' but think that

the father's name, though doubtless influencing the choice of the son's, was like the son's originally a short-name from Μενέλαος, etc., as the author suggests (p. 198). Our complaint is that the author has not applied this principle much more widely. We would strongly recommend every reader to study § 105 before turning to the subdivisions of proper names on the preceding pages.

This slight blemish, however, does not impair the value of the work as a whole. It is a most thorough and useful investigation, and one that must have demanded a great deal of patience and hard labour to carry out. No future Greek Grammar will be complete, that does not recognise the results of Mr. Petersen's research. There is a complete index of words in -ισκο- -ισκη-.

The following misprints have been noticed: p. 156, l. 25, *wich* for *which*; p. 157, l. 12, *scarcelly* for *scarcely*; p. 159 (heading), -ισχο for -ισκο-; p. 160, l. 20, *as* for *an*; p. 164, note 1, l. 2, *quotes* for *quoted*; p. 175, l. 4, *do* for *to*; p. 178, l. 9, *δφαχμαί* for *δραχμαί*; p. 189, l. 17, *do* for *to*; p. 193, l. 28, *Tiberias* for *Tiberius*. On p. 197, l. 3, we read 'Metapontinan.' Surely this is an unnecessary innovation for the usual 'Metapontine'!

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

The University, Manchester

STUDIES IN GREEK NOUN-FORMATION.

Studies in Greek Noun-Formation. Labial Terminations III. and IV. By E. H. STURTEVANT. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1913. Published in the United Kingdom by the Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, as agents for the University of Chicago Press.

Labial Terminations III. and IV. are a continuation of two earlier studies on the same subject. I. (1910) contained a discussion of words formed by means of a β-suffix, II. (1911) those with a φ-suffix. In the present numbers we have in III. words in -πη or -πα (also -πα̃)—in -πης

or -πᾶς, gen. -που—in -πος and -πον, gen. -που, and in IV. words in -ψ. Finally we have *Additions and Corrections to Labial Terminations I.-IV.*

In III. Mr. Sturtevant commences with a discussion of words of the ἄλλοδαπός and ποδαπός type, and mentions a variety of explanations, including a new one by Buck, who would divide the words ἄλλο-δαπός, etc., and considers them originally possessive compounds, accented *ἄλλο-δαπος, etc. *Δαπος he would connect with δάπτω, δαπάνη, daps, as derived from a simpler root da, dā, meaning 'divide.' -δαπος would mean 'division, district, region,' and ἄλλοδαπός be equivalent to ἄλλόδημος, ἀλλόφυλος.

Mr. Sturtevant then deals fully with words in -οψ, -ωψ, -οπος, -ωπος, formed from the root ὀπ- 'see.' He shows that in some (εὐρύοπα, τηλωπός, etc.), the root still has a verbal force, 'seeing' or 'seen'; in this group he places πρόσωπον and μέτωπον, though it is not quite easy to discover the exact meaning of the words in this connection. Then we pass to the group containing the meaning 'eye' in the second member. From this we get the meaning 'face,' which 'is often generalised into "appearance," as in οἶνοπι πόντω, etc.' We are shown that -οψ is a favourite form in Homer, whereas -ωπος is rare; in later Greek the reverse is the case. -οψ and -ωψ became mere suffixes even in prehistoric times and lost the original force of the root; this suffix was especially common in the names of animals (κέρκωψ, κώνωψ, σκάλοψ, etc.). πηνελόπη is apparently derived from πηνέλοψ, a kind of duck. A number of names of diseases are also formed with the same suffix. We cannot, however, agree with Mr. Sturtevant, when he stigmatises the translations of βοῶπις 'ox-eyed' and γλαυκῶπις 'owl-eyed' as 'absurd.' He would recognise a mere meaningless suffix -ωπις (fem. of -ωψ) in both words, and translate 'to whom the ox (owl) is sacred.' But why are a number of women called βοῶπις in Homer? We do not think Mr. Sturtevant has surmounted this difficulty satisfactorily. In later compounds in -ώψ and -ωπός the meaning 'having the appearance of'

was first weakened to 'like,' and then faded away altogether, so that ἀγριωπὸν ὄμμα (Eur.) is the same as ἄγριον ὄμμα, σκυθρωπός means no more than σκυθρός, ἀντωπός is the mere equivalent of ἀντίος, ἄισωπος of ἄισιος 'auspicious,' etc. When this process was taking place, we find new compounds in -πρόσωπος 'face' and -οφθαλμός 'eye' being formed, where the full force of the second element of the compound is required. Ethnica, place-names, and personal names are discussed, and finally a few other words in -πη, -πος (compounds of ἵππος, ποδ-, etc.). An important and just observation is that 'in the majority of those words which make up our lists π is obviously a part of the root,' and 'there is no sufficient evidence of an Indo-European suffix -ρο- or -γμο-, such as would yield Greek -πο-.' Sixteen pages of text are followed by twenty-eight of word-lists.

In IV. Mr. Sturtevant practically confines himself to a discussion of loan-words and those of uncertain etymology. Seven pages of text are followed by five of word-lists. The volume closes with three pages of *Additions and Corrections*.

A great deal of interesting matter has been gathered together in these *Studies*. A welcome feature are the copious references to other writings on the same subject. The word-lists are drawn up in a very convenient way for reference.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

The University, Manchester.

THE TEACHING OF LATIN.

Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils.

By J. BEZARD. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 424.
Paris: Libraire Vuibert, 1914. 3.50 francs.

WE fear that far too many classical scholars, deeply immersed in their University work or in some other sphere of more or less advanced research, give never a thought to the slow and patient labours of their humbler brethren who are daily giving of their best in the schools of the country in

order to train up a future generation that shall be capable and worthy of carrying on the traditions of classical scholarship. They are far too content to take the material that is sent up to them from the schools for granted; occasionally they may emit a surly grunt at the poorness of the quality; rarely do they bestow a thought upon the process by which it has been manufactured. In this country the reforms associated with the term 'Direct Method' have received remarkably small notice—

not to speak of encouragement—from the higher branches of the teaching profession. But it does really behove us to take a little more intelligent interest in the classical work of our schools. The publication of the present volume indicates, we trust, a somewhat better attitude on the part of those interested in the classics in France to the work of French school-masters.

As an exposition of a reformed standpoint of teaching this book appears to us to be far behind the position which is held in this country by supporters of the Direct Method. M. Bezard insists very strongly and—as it seems to us—equally rightly upon the necessity of a very strict preliminary training in formal grammar before the pupil is allowed to enter upon the study of Latin at all. Thus a sure foundation is laid before the new language is approached, and each pupil has to build upon that foundation for himself by making his own *instruments de travail* as they are called. These consist in the earliest period of note-books for vocabulary, accidence, and conjugation schemes, etc. Later on a note-book of idioms—not a mere tourist's phrase-book, but a means of logical and scientific comparison of the difference between the idioms of the two languages—is started, and these note-books are kept on throughout the School work as essential means of tackling any text. All this is excellent, as is also the distinction between *les exercices de contrôle* and *les exercices d'acquisition*; the superstition of the paramount importance of written work is exposed, and the position maintained that it is oral work which really teaches while written work is but a test of knowledge acquired. Nothing could be better than the humorous description of the state of mind of the poor bewildered boy, slave to his dictionary, who hunts

about page after page in that dictionary for one or other of the unknown words he finds in the text before him, until he quite forgets what it is that he was looking for!

So far so good; what is more surprising is to find the old *construe* with its attendant parsing and analysis taken for granted throughout as the only mode of procedure. Thus we find even boys *en première* (our sixth form, we presume) engaged in picking out the subject and indirect object of a sentence in Livy. If M. Bezard comes some day to attack this traditional method of work we feel that he will accomplish something of real value for improving the methods of teaching in his country. He has already gone a good way—a boy is not asked to write until he is capable, with care, of writing correctly (the ideal of *zéro faute* is ever laid before him), the text is prepared in class rather than at home; boys take the part of master and ask their fellows questions upon the text before them. But they are never free from this eternal analysis and parsing; transcripts of actual lessons are given, and we find that it takes an hour and forty-five minutes to extract the meat out of some twenty-five lines of Livy. We can do better than this as regards the *language* teaching by our reformed methods here in England, but perhaps we may learn something from this book about the teaching of *literature*. This is a difficult subject and success depends almost entirely upon the personality of the teacher, but we recommend every classical schoolmaster to read the appreciations of Virgil, written by M. Bezard's pupils, and given here in full, and then to ask himself whether he has led his own pupils to a like appreciation.

R. B. APPLETON.

Perse School, Cambridge.

A NEW EDITION OF FIRMICUS.

Iulii Materni Firmici Matheseos Libri VIII., ediderunt W. Kroll, F. Skutsch, K. Ziegler; *Fasciculus II.* Pp. lxxvii + 558. Teubner, 1913. M. 12.

IF the ghosts of third-rate writers are in any degree moved by the devotion of a distant posterity, Iulius Firmicus Maternus Iunior Siculus V.C. must be accounted happy: he has certainly received at the hand of Messrs. Kroll, Skutsch, and Ziegler double for any neglect he may have suffered in the past. The *Mathesis* was written not long before the death of Constantine (†337). (It is dated by comparing the reference to that emperor at 1. 10. 13, with the allusion to the solar eclipse of 334 at 1. 4. 10 and with the mention of the praefecture of Rufius Albinus at 2. 29. 10). About ten years later Firmicus published, for the admonition of Constantine's sons, the treatise *De Errore Profanarum Religionum*. The *Mathesis* is the work of a pagan astrologer, and informed throughout by a mild and Christian spirit. The *De Errore* is the work of a Christian apologist, full of fanaticism and all uncharitableness. This spiritual paradox (to which, one would have thought, even quite modern times furnish numerous analogues) led Bursian and others to propound the view that the two books were the work of different authors—it was even gravely suggested that the pagan and the Christian, having but one name between them, were perhaps first cousins. This sceptical view has now been rendered untenable by the researches of F. Moore, F. Boll, A. Mueller, and our three editors. The Chozizontes will no more trouble us.

Between the fourth and the twelfth centuries there seems to be no reference to Firmicus in any writer. About the beginning of the twelfth century, Honorius the Solitary, of Autun, mentions him, together with Ptolemy, as a supreme authority in judicial astrology. A little later occur two mentions of him in the works of

William of Malmesbury.¹ One of these carries us back to the eleventh century, instructing us that Girard, Archbishop of York, 'among other sins read Firmicus.' It was said that under his pillow, when he died by a sudden death, was found concealed a copy of the *Mathesis*. The wicked Archbishop seems to have done his best to propagate the study of his favourite author. One of his pupils was the nameless author of a work upon English Law entitled *Quadripartitus* (414), and every page of the *Quadripartitus* bears witness to a close imitation of the diction of Firmicus. Another Englishman of the twelfth century who refers to Firmicus is Daniel of Morley (before 1200). Girard, Archbishop of York, acquired his learning in Normandy. Kroll and Ziegler suppose, therefore, that Firmicus migrated with Girard from France to England. But the Library of York was rich in all varieties of ancient literature; and it is perhaps possible that it was in York itself that Girard first made acquaintance with Firmicus. It is true that our best MSS. of Firmicus comes from France; but they seem to be not older in any case than Girard, and prior to Girard there is no continental reference to Firmicus.

Kroll and Ziegler enumerate no less than 43 MSS. of the *Mathesis*—there is only one of the *De Errore*. Three of these 43 are of outstanding merit, *M.P.R.*, all of saec. XI. There are also two thirteenth-century codd. of the same stock, which, though a good deal 'corrected,' are of value. None of these five, however, extend beyond c. 22 of Book IV. We are thrown back, therefore, for the last half of the work on late and inferior MSS.; and it is here that the extended researches of the new editors deserve especial commendation. It must be remembered that they owe nothing to previous editors. Firmicus has hitherto

¹ Whom I find referred to in a German dictionary as 'William Sommerset und Wilton.'

been commonly read in the edition of Pruckner; and this, like all other texts, is little more than a reproduction of the Aldine. Particular mention should be made of the elaborate Index Verborum with which Ziegler has furnished the work of himself and his colleagues. This is of great value to the student of astrology, and also to the student of the Latin of this period generally. The *De Errore* is furnished with a similar Index, which should be of service, I imagine, to students of the Latin texts of the Bible—Firmicus' Biblical quotations are very numerous.

The new interest in Firmicus is due largely to the increased vogue of Manilius. (Firmicus nowhere mentions Manilius: but in Books IV. and VIII. he has pillaged him shamelessly.) It

is due also to the wider study of astrological literature as a whole—a study greatly promoted by the Catalogues of Boll and Cumont. Firmicus is also interesting to the student of prose-rhythm. Ziegler in Vol. I. has a great deal of interesting matter on the subject of Firmicus' *clausulae*.

This is yet another work bearing the name of Franz Skutsch, which that distinguished scholar was destined to leave uncompleted. These posthumous issues are a notable witness to the fullness and variety of Skutsch's labours, and serve to remind us of the vast loss which Latin scholarship has sustained in his untimely death.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

A Selection of Latin Verse, ed. by the Instructors in Latin in Williams College (published by H. Milford on behalf of the Yale University Press, 3s. 6d. net), is an excellent anthology 'representative of the best Latin poetry of all periods,' well chosen, clearly printed and nicely bound. 'The editors plan to publish later brief explanatory notes.' This book is very similar in size and character to Mr. Cook's volume in the Golden Treasury series. It is suitable for occasional reading in a fifth or sixth form, and well worth keeping *animi causa* when schooldays are over.

Σ.

Sophocles in English Verse. Part II: *Aias, Electra, Trachinian Maidens, Philoctetes*. By ARTHUR S. WAY, D. Lit. Crown 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 276. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 3s. 6d.

It is difficult for the same man to translate successfully Sophocles and Euripides, and more than once we seem to discern the translator of Euripides in this volume. The impassioned repetitions of Electra's speech, 804, etc., are alien from the bitter de-

liberateness of Sophocles' heroine, and we miss again and again in the translation that sense of 'effortless mastery,' which has been attributed to Sophocles. A poet who rejoiced in the dexterous use of simple words wrested from their ordinary meaning does not supply the best field for a translator who loves an exotic vocabulary, and who represents such words as *ἄφοβος* and *τάλας* in the original by 'mistrustless' and 'unbending-souled,' and who can translate *δύστηνος τροφός* by 'woeful fostress.' It would take Alexandria rather than Athens to have supplied the original of such translations as:

'I spied the army-chief,
Agamemnon, posting hither for our bane.
I trow he will unrein a froward tongue.'

or—

'When life runs smooth, then most behoves
to watch
Life, lest unwares in ruin thou be whelmed.'

Here Sophocles, rather than Dr. Way, 'runs smooth.'

The translation of these four plays possesses the distinctive merits of Dr. Way's work—fidelity to the original in at any rate the iambic parts, sound judgment in interpretation of passages

where the meaning is doubtful, spirit and dash in translating the choruses, though here he departs very far from his author and errs on the side of excessive amplitude. We must admire the variety of metres employed in translating the lyrics, though we may question the suitability of some of them. The rhythm of the half chorus in *Ajax* 865 is too suggestive of a Nursery Rhyme, and we want a setting by Sir A. Sullivan to the Chorus in the *Philoctetes* (676, etc.). Other criticisms have to be made: there are too many inharmonious lines and phrases, such as 'Shamed were I, dames, if I should seem to you.' 'Know, nought I wot,' 'Grant that I, aye living,' 'mares' ears.' However continuous the flow of blank verse may be, it is not well that a line detached from its context should suggest poetry so little as 'Is, and of me: yet hear what boon of thee.' The rhymes sometimes are too reminiscent of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*—e.g., Vision . . . Nysian; levin . . . heaven; please . . . cease; yearning . . . turning. It could be wished that Dr. Way's work were always up to the level of his best, but side by side we find excellent, strong lines, and some which are prosaic or mannered. We may quote, for instance, *Ajax* 758-761:

'For lives grown proud, and profitless to Heaven,
Fall by stern visitation of the gods'—
So spake the seer—'yea, whoso, mortal-born
By nature, thinks not mortal-lowly thoughts.'

and *Phil.* 104-105:

Neop. How? Hath he aweless might so terrible?
Od. Unerring shafts he hath: death rides on them.

The first has a sudden *diminuendo*; the second a sudden *crescendo* of worth.

A. S. OWEN.

Lucian. Vol. I. Translated by A. M. HARMON. 12mo. Pp. xii + 471. London: Heinemann (Loeb Classical Library), 1913. Price 5s.

MR. A. M. HARMON has produced in the Loeb Classics the first instalment

of a translation of Lucian; his first volume contains fifteen treatises or dialogues, including some like the *Judicium Vocalium* of rather doubtful paternity. It is a very readable translation, best when rendering descriptive passages, good in the narrative, sometimes (but not often) less successful in the dialogue, where the combination of solemn and colloquial language produces a more stilted effect in the English than in the Greek. Modern equivalent phrases are happily introduced, but the work is not made to teem with neologisms; the puns are sometimes courageously attempted (might Berkeley be suggested for Barson on p. 167, as the name of a real philosopher?). The passages rendered from the dramatists on pp. 241, 439 and 463 suggest that Mr. Harmon is less at home in translating verse. A few misprints and errors may be noted. On p. 115 a sentence in the translation has gone wrong: 'because' or some such word has been omitted; on p. 124 *ὑπερλότερον*, and on p. 195 'plan' for 'place' may be noted as misprints. On p. 292 *ὠμοφάγον* need not mean 'cannibals': it is not implied that they ate one another; on p. 328 to translate *μυσταττόμενος τὴν κναμοφαγίαν* by 'he detested beans' hardly does justice to the conscientious motives of the abstainer; on p. 401 'Palamedes of Nauplia' is a mistranslation of *Παλαμῆδης ὁ Ναυπλίου*, and on p. 446 *παροινούντες* implies a more violent result of intoxication than is suggested by 'maudlin.' A few short notes supply necessary information on the allusions; one on Philoxenus on p. 377 might be added.

A. S. OWEN.

Papyri Iandanae. 8vo. Fasc. I., by E. Schaefer, pp. 1-34, 4 plates. Fasc. II., by L. Eisner, pp. 35-74, 3 plates. Fasc. III., by L. Spohr, pp. 75-124, 4 plates. Fasc. IV., by G. Spiess, pp. 125-160, 3 plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912-14.

THE *Papyri Iandanae* are a small collection so named from the printers and publishers, Messrs. K. R. and J. F. Ianda, to whose liberality it owes its

foundation. For the present it is in the keeping of Prof. Kalbfleisch, now of Giessen, and is being edited by some of his pupils, under his supervision. Of the four slender parts which have so far appeared, the first consists of literary fragments, the second of letters, and the other two of miscellaneous documents. It can hardly be said that any of these papyri, either literary or documentary, are of outstanding merit. The former section comprises a scrap of *Iliad* Δ; some early but very fragmentary scholia on Θ; short astrological and grammatical pieces; another still slighter, of doubtful content; a Christian amulet, including the Lord's Prayer; and a second unidentified Christian fragment. Of the private letters the most noteworthy is No. 9, referring to an action at law which the archidicastes had been delegated by the praefect to decide. The other papyri, many of which are very imperfectly preserved, are divided fairly equally between the Roman and Byzantine periods; they belong for the most part to familiar types, but are not without small points of interest. An instance of compulsory cultivation of domain land in the reign of Trajan is apparently to be recognised in No. 27. An imperial rescript in Latin, showing that in the second century the class of minor officials called *chiristae* formed a corporation, and were subject to a property qualification, is unfortunately much mutilated. The editing is careful and competent, though, as Wilcken's notes in *Archiv* vi., pp. 292 *sqq.*, indicate, the decipherments are not incapable of improvement.

A. S. H.

An Elementary Latin Grammar, by E. E. Bryant and E. D. C. Lake (Clarendon Press, 1s. 6d.), gives the most important parts of the accidence clearly printed and divided into four stages by the use of different type and lines down the side of the page. The book seems suitable only for very young beginners; even for them we prefer a book which tells more about the language. There is no difficulty in distinguishing the things to be learned by heart from the

explanatory matter which is to be referred to when occasion arises. The gender rhymes are very poor; they don't scan and they don't include some important words, e.g. *arbor*; on the other hand *praedo* and *consul* surely need not be given. We hope the advice to decline *ullus* and *solus* like *alius* will not be followed too strictly.

An Elementary Latin Grammar, by A. Sloman (170 pp., Cambridge University Press, 2s. 6d.), is meant for students from the senior forms of Preparatory Schools up to the standard of Matriculation. There are a few new features, but none that call for special notice. There is a tendency to make these books too short and to leave out much that is important and interesting. For instance, one wants a list of irregular verbs classified according to formation; here we have only an alphabetical list. It is stated (p. 75) that no Imperative of *ēdo* occurs in Classical. This is not true; *es* occurs in Plautus (e.g. *Mil.* 677) and Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. On the other hand we doubt if there is evidence till quite late Latin for the form *ede* given in an example on p. 119. On p. 92 it is stated that the genitives *magni*, *parvi*, etc., are used with verbs of buying and selling (as well as with verbs of valuing); this is true only of *pluris*, *minoris*, *tanti*, *quantum*. Cicero, for instance, has (*Verr.* 3. 40 and 43), *magno vendidi*, *pluris vendidisti*, *minoris vendidit*, and *quam plurimo venderet*.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen. Von GUSTAV HERBIG (Sitzungsberichte der königl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1914, 2 Abhandlung). München: Verlag der königl. Bayer. Akademie, 1914. pp. 39.

THE progress toward the solution of the Etruscan problem is steady, but very, very slow. If, indeed, wealth could be attracted to the search, and excavations could be carried on in the borderland of the Etruscan and Latin

districts, a bilingual inscription might be unearthed which (like the Rosetta stone) would give us in a moment the key to the problem. As it is, we have to wait until the slow accumulation of sifted fact and the deliberate calculation of this and that and the other probability lead us inch by inch into the region of certainty. Of course the 'crank' with his ready-made solution of the mystery appears from time to time; but if we resolutely keep silent about the 'crank' and his theories and think of him in Martial's fashion—'Nam te cur aliquis sciat fuisse?'—he will not much hinder progress.

Prof. Herbig, the editor of the *Corpus of Etruscan Inscriptions*, is the sanest and safest of guides. When he writes on the subject, his readers are usually inclined to go a good deal further than the writer himself. He gives us here material for comparing the names (of persons and places) in the Etruscan language and in the pre-Greek languages of Asia Minor. He warns us of the necessity of caution and takes as his motto, 'Incendo per ignes.' But we cannot help feeling that a strong case has been made out in support of the 'Father of Truth,' old Herodotus (I. 94), who found the home of the Etruscans in Lydia.

W. M. LINDSAY.

Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos. Wiedergebottelt, übersetzt und erklärt von RUDOLF ASMUS. Pp. xvi + 224. Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1911.

HERR ASMUS is already known to students of later Hellenism by his translation of the writings of the Emperor Julian, as well as by contributions to various periodicals on subjects connected with the history of Neo-

platonism. In this volume he gives us a translation, with explanatory comments, of a revised Greek text, without the text itself. The importance of the work lies in the way that the existing fragmentary material is pieced together, and welded into one tolerably complete and consecutive whole. That material is mainly derived from Photios, who supplies 312 paragraphs, supplemented by some Glosses of Suidas. The translator indicates his own expository additions to the text and connecting links by the use of brackets and italics, in a clear and concise way; and a series of three Indexes, of Names, Topics, and References, serve to complete a work which should prove very useful to students of the history of thought in the fifth and sixth centuries.

R. G. B.

Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt. Von Professor AUGUST HEISENBERG. (Beck. 40 pp. M. 0.80.)

THE interest of this little book for classical scholars lies in the connection which the author traces between the renaissance of interest in classical studies in Winckelmann's time and the help rendered to the cause of Greek independence in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. Under Ludwig I. of Bavaria large sums of money were collected; and poets and professors alike endeavoured to pay back to the Greece of their day some part of what they owed to the Greece of old. The brochure is a piece of impassioned pleading for the support of Greek independence; the maintenance of the spirit of patriotism in the people through centuries of Turkish oppression and of their language ('vor allem auch die Sprache') is largely due, Professor Heisenberg holds, to the influence of the Greek Church.

M. P.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I DESIRE to chronicle in these pages the death in battle, in East Prussia, of my friend and collaborator, Hans Wegehaupt. Those who are interested in the text of Plutarch will be acquainted with the important studies he has published on the *Moralia*. He did not, unhappily, survive to edit those treatises, which he had undertaken in the new Teubner edition, but this edition (he was helping me with the proofs of Vol. I. when the war broke out) will owe more than I can say to his industry and insight. It was he, chiefly, who undertook the task of examining and estimating the very numerous MSS. of the *Moralia*, and made it

possible for us to proceed with confidence to the task of editing. It is very sad that he should not have been spared to gather himself the fruit of his labour. The most difficult of the tasks he undertook was the decyphering of the Florence palimpsest, in which Diogenes has been written over a *Moralia* MS. (the earliest we possess). He persevered in this at the risk of permanent injury to his eyes. The conclusions he reached about the relationship of the MSS. in general are perfectly certain, and we owe it chiefly to him that we can reject with confidence all that is worthless, and build a text on a sure foundation.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

American Journal of Philology. Edited by B. L. Gildersleeve. Vol. XXXV. 3, Whole No. 139. Pp. 245-378. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1914.

Buffet (E. P.) *The Layman Revato: A Story of a Restless Mind in Buddhist India at the Time of Greek Influence*. 12" x 9". Pp. vi+106. New York: McMurtrie, 1914. Cloth, \$2.

Classical Association of Scotland. Proceedings, 1913-14. 8" x 6½". Pp. vi+128. Edinburgh: Pillans and Wilson, 1914. Cloth.

Classical Philology: A Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in the Languages, Literature, History, and Life of Classical Antiquity. Vol. IX., No. 4. October, 1914. 9½" x 6½". Pp. vi+345-472. University of Chicago Press.

Davis (G. M. N.) *The Asiatic Dionysos*. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xii+276. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Dean (L. R.) *Index to Facsimiles in the Palaeographical Society Publications*. 9½" x 6¾". Pp. 55. Princeton, N.J.: The University Library, 1914. Paper boards, \$1 net.

Harcum (C. G.) *Roman Cooks* (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9" x 6". Pp. 88. Baltimore: Furst Company, 1914.

Havet (L.) *Notes Critiques sur le texte de Festus*. 10" x 6½". Pp. 58. Paris: H. Champion, 1914. Fr. 2.50.

Mathena. No. XL. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xvi+174. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co., 1914. 4s.

Hodges (C. E.) *A Latin Notebook*. 8½" x 6¾". Pp. viii+128. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Paper boards, 2s.

Homer (Iliad) Translated into English by A. Lang, W. Leaf, and E. Myers. Revised edition. 7½" x 5". Pp. viii+508. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 3s. 6d.

Jatta (M.) *Tombe Canosine del Museo Provinciale di Bari*. 10" x 6½". Pp. 90-126, with 3 coloured plates and 17 illustrations in text. Rome: Von Loescher and Co., 1914.

Livy (Book III.) By P. T. Jones. 7½" x 5". Pp. 282. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d; without vocabulary, 2s. 6d.

Loeb Classical Library. Caesar: *The Civil Wars* (A. G. Peskett), pp. v+370. Ovid: *Heroides and Amores* (G. S. Showerman), pp. viii+524. Procopius (H. B. Dewing), Vol. I., pp. xvi+584. Xenophon: *Cyropaedia* (W. Miller), Vol. II., pp. vi+478. Dio's Roman History, Vol. III., pp. viii+519. Plutarch's Lives (B. Perrin), Vol. I., pp. xix+582; Vol. II., pp. x+631. 6½" x 4¼". London: W. Heinemann, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net each.

Paetow (L. J.) *The Battle of the Seven Arts: A French Poem by Henri d'Andeli, trouvère of the thirteenth century*. Edited and translated by L. J. P. *Memoirs of the University of California: History*, Vol. I., No. 1. 13½" x 10". Pp. 63, 10 plates. Berkeley, 1914.

Plato. *The Apology of Socrates*. Edited by A. M. Adam. (Elementary Classics.) 6¾" x 4¾". Pp. xx+109. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Weeks (K.) *Science, Sentiments, and Senses*. 7½" x 5". Pp. viii+232. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.

The Classical Review

MARCH, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS *PERSAE*.

13. *πᾶσα γὰρ ἰσχὺς Ἀσιατογενὴς ᾤχωκε*
νέον δ' ἄνδρα βαύζει.

I hope to show that Paley was right in thinking that *θυμός* is the subject of *βαύζει*, though in other ways Paley missed the sense. The change of subject is the only difficulty, and I venture to think (1) that far more serious difficulties are involved if we try to make *ισχύς* the subject, and (2) that the composition of the whole poem and also the ideas suggested to Greek hearers by *βαύζει* make the connection with *θυμός* obvious for a Greek.

The best version among those which make *ισχύς* the subject is that of Mr. C. E. S. Headlam: 'All the strength of the Asian nation is gone abroad, and murmurs at having a new king.' This has the merit of recognising the significance of *νέον*. As Walter Headlam pointed out, Xerxes is doomed precisely because *νέος ἐὼν νέα φρονεῖ*, a theme which runs through the play. We should do better if we translated 'a new and young king.' Further, however, we shall improve on this version if we try to represent a little more closely the construction of the accusative. *ὑλακτεῖν τινα* can certainly mean 'to bark at somebody,' but *νέον ἄνδρα βαύζειν* (or *ὑλακτεῖν*) is different, cannot well mean 'to bark at someone as young.' The scholiast says *ἄσαφώς λέγει*, and this shows the true construction. Just as *νέον τὸν ἄνδρα λέγω* means 'I call the

man young,' so, by the normal rules of lyrical heightening, *νέον τὸν ἄνδρα βαύζω* can mean 'I growl him young,' 'I call him, in a tone of harassed and suppressed indignation, young.' But there remains a difficulty not to be surmounted. Why does the chorus use this extraordinary *ἄνδρα* instead of *τὸν ἄνακτα*? If *ισχύς* is really the subject throughout this sentence, the most natural sense, or nonsense, is 'and grumbles at a young man,' or 'and growling calls a man, or a hero, young.' We need some reason of context which may save the sense by forcing us to interpret *ἄνδρα* as *the man par excellence*, Xerxes himself. Finally, after we have wrestled with the difficulty of the expression, we are left with a difficulty of thought. Why should Aeschylus make his chorus hint at disaffection in the army, a theme not later developed, and a theme not very suitable to a chorus whose general effect is to show us the excessive and dangerous reverence with which Xerxes is surrounded?

Now if we turn our attention to the scheme on which the first lines of the play are composed we shall find the clue. Symmetry is used at the outset to impress the ear with these themes which are to be woven into the fabric of the poem. First, we hear *οἰχομένων*, chosen instead of the colourless *βεβηκότων* of Phrynichus, in order to sound the first note of disaster heard so clearly in *ᾤχωκε* at l. 13. Then, in l. 3, the idea

of riches, already expressed to the understanding by ἀφνεῶν, is thrown at our imagination (some editors are ungrateful) in the opulent πολυχρύσων. Thirdly, the first mention of the hero is made in a royal phrase, dangerous as overweening, αὐτὸς ἀναξ . . . Δαρειογενής.

We have, then, first, the army gone, the gold, the king. Now see what follows : ἀμφὶ δὲ νόστῳ τῷ βασιλείῳ καὶ πολυχρύσου στρατιᾶς, my heart is stirred with anxiety, because the strength of Asia is gone . . . and . . . What do we expect? Is it not αὐτός, the king. Well, that is what ἄνδρα gives us. It means, not 'the hero,' nor 'the king,' but simply αὐτός. It is because it is so prepared that we can understand without needing an article. The regular sway of thought, army king, king army, army king, makes it safe also for the poet to change the subject of the sentence: we know that we are to hear the opinion, not of the army on the king, but of the chorus, anxious about both. Like courtiers, they speak with caution. As to the army, as a plain matter of tragic fact, 'it is gone': and as to the king, 'well . . . my boding heart mutters him firebrand.' The subject of ὀρσοπολεῖται, dropped for the moment, is resumed for this psychologically admirable βαῦζει.

The fine piece of characterisation depends for its success on the immediate apprehension of the audience that θυμός is the subject. That was made certain by the fact that the audience, unlike some editors, remembered Homer. βαῦζει to a Greek mind follows so naturally after words about an anxious, restless heart. A reference to *Od.* xx. 13 makes all plain. Read how Odysseus, angry, yet controlling his anger, felt his heart 'barking' like a bitch that has not yet recognised a man for friend or foe; not exactly barking, but rather rumbling within, as she wonders whether she shall bark or not, or even perhaps bite. Then read the comment of Plutarch, *Mor.* 506b. Then if you still think that ἰσχύς is the subject of βαῦζει, read aloud with what pleasure you can the poem which begins τάδε μὲν Περσῶν, and see if you do not feel shaken in your conviction as you hear the words:

οἰχομένων . . . πολυχρύσων . . . αὐτὸς
ἀναξ Δαρειογενής
νόστῳ βασιλείῳ . . . πολυχρύσου στρατιᾶς
ἰσχύς Ἀσιατογενής . . . ἄνδρα.

Only by realising the effects obtained by this swaying movement in the first fifteen lines can we appreciate the splendid climax of ll. 59-65.

332. τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων νῦν ὑπεμνήσθην
πέρῃ.
πολλῶν παρόντων <δ> ὀλίγ' ἀπαγ-
γέλλω κακά.

Weil's τοσόνδε seems necessary for the conclusion of the messenger's speech. ἀρχόντων is generally recognised as a gloss and Weil, from Hesych. Ταγοί . . . ἄρχοντες read, as Hermann had suggested, ταγῶν νῦν. But νῦν appears in M only as a late correction, and is frigid. Dion. Hal. R.A. v. 74 Θεσσαλοὶ ἄρχοντες . . . καλοῦντες (whereas the Thessalians really called them ταγούς) suggests that ταγῶν may really have been sometimes glossed by ἀρχῶν, which has indeed been conjectured here. I suspect that Aeschylus wrote τοσόνδε ταγῶν τῶνδ' ὑπεμνήσθην πέρῃ.

231. ταῦτα δ' ὥς ἐφίεσαι
πάντα θήσομεν θεοῖσι τοῖς τ' ἐνερθε
γῆς φίλοις.

This cannot mean, as Mr. C. E. S. Headlam puts it, 'All these things, as thou dost enjoin, will I perform for the gods. . . .' Notice the stress and the contrast with κείνα, which forbids this interpretation of ταῦτα even if you can bring yourself to suppose that θήσω can mean 'I will perform (a rite).' ταῦτα means 'these anxieties,' the troubles of the dream. What Atossa says is, 'As you bid me, I will put all these things that trouble me into the hands of the gods': ἐκτελοῖτο δὲ τὰ χρηστά· ταῦτα δ' . . . But θήσομεν θεοῖς cannot bear this meaning either. Read πάντ' ἐφήσομεν, remembering Hesych. Ἐφίημι . . . ἐπιτρέπω and Ἐφίησι· ἐπιτρέπει. Atossa entrusts her troubles to the gods, as the sailor his ship or his sails to the wind and sea (this a common use with or without the object; add to L and S this use from Symmachus Ep. 4, p. 160d, 'the helmsman ἐπαφίησι τὴν ναὺν τῷ πελάγει, and cf. Leonid. Tarent. 57, 6,

πάσαν ἐφείς ὁθόνην, Plutarch *Pyrrh.* xv.), as the orator who professes *περὶ παντός ἂν εἰπεῖν ἐφείς τῷ καιρῷ* Philostr. *V.S.* I, Proem., I. 24 II., or *τῇ γλώττῃ* II. to I., or as Heracles, trusting not to a single marriage . . . but *τῇ φύσει πολλὰς γενῶν ἀρχὰς καὶ καταβολὰς ἀπολιπεῖν ἐφίεντος* Plutarch *Ant.* xxxvi. There is perhaps also a hint of the legal reference to a higher court (like the orator's *εἰς . . . ἐφίεναι*): for the dative in this connection cf. Lucian I. 9, *τέλος δ' ἐφίᾱσι μοι δικάζειν ὁποτέρᾳ βουλοίμην συνεῖναι αὐτῶν*, though there, as perhaps in *Trag. Fr. Adesp.* 474, *θεοῦ ἐφίεντος τυχῇ*, the gloss should be *συνχωρῶν* rather than *ἐπιτρέπων*. The formula is Homeric: *ἀλλ' ἔχε σιγῇ μῦθον, ἐπιτρέψου δὲ θεοῖσιν* *Od.* xix., 502, and *νῦν μὲν παῦσαι τόξον, ἐπιτρέψαι δὲ θεοῖσιν* *Od.* xxi., 279. Add Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 5. 34 *τοὺς δὲ τεθυηκότας θάπτειν ἐφήκετοῖς προσήκουσιν*.

357-360. *μη σοι δοκοῦμεν τῇδε λειφθῆναι μάχῃ;*

ἀλλ' ὦδε δαίμων τις κατέφθειρε στρατόν, τάλαντα βρίσας οὐκ ἰσορρόπῃ τύχῃ. θεοὶ πόλιν σώζουσι Παλλάδος θεάς.

The accepted reading and punctuation is open to two objections: (1) *ἀλλ' ὦδε* is unnatural and indeed, in spite of ingenious defending, inexplicable. It might be tolerable as the first words of a reply by Atossa, 'Well but, if that is so . . .', but to assign the line to Atossa is to spoil the effect of the messenger's speech. (2) The first line cannot, as is

commonly supposed, mean, 'You surely cannot think our numbers were inferior.' This interpretation stresses *λειφθῆναι*, and anyone who is in the habit of reading aloud knows, if he attends to the natural order of words in Greek, that the stress must come on *τῇδε*. The line, as it stands, could only mean 'You don't surely think we were inferior' (in numbers, if you like) 'in this fight.' The less you stress *τῇδε*, moreover, the more impossible it is to understand *λειφθῆναι* as 'we were worsted in respect of numbers,' the more you approximate to 'we were beaten in this fight.'

Now the scholiast, misunderstood by Hermann, was explaining *τῇδε* when he wrote *ἐνταῦθα ἡγουν εἰς τὸ πλήθος*, and the ancient conjecture *δοκῶμεν* was right. Punctuate thus:

μή σοι δοκῶμεν τῇδε λειφθῆναι μάχῃ, ἀλλ' ὦδε· δαίμων κ.τ.λ.

λειφθῆναι μάχῃ (with *μαχῇ* as little stressed as often are *χερί, δορί*), means 'we proved inferior in the fight,' and the sense is not obscure. 'Do not suppose it was this way (in numbers) that we proved inferior in the fight; no, 'twas in other wise. 'Twas a fell spirit destroyed us. . . . The gods themselves. . . .' Only thus do you preserve the natural stress of the first line, obtain full value from the mention of the *δαίμων*, and finally account for the asyndeton of *θεοί*.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

THREE EMENDATIONS IN THEOPHRASTUS *HISTORIA PLANTARUM*.

I. H. P. i. 13. 5. Description of the flower of the pomegranate:

Γίνεται δὲ καὶ τό γε τῆς ρόας ἄνθος πολὺ καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ ὅλως ὁ ὄγκος πλατὺς ὥσπερ ὁ ρόων· κάτωθεν δ' ἕτεροι δι' ὧν ὡς μικρὸν ὥσπερ ἐκτετραμμένος κύτινος ἔχων τὰ χεῖλη μυχώδη.

This is the reading of three of the four principal MSS., *U* (*Cod. Urbinas*), *M.* (*C. Medicus*), *V.* (*C. Vindobonensis*), except that for *κύτινος* they all give *κότινος*, an obvious blunder, for *ὦν U*

gives *ὦν* (erased), for *μυχώδη M* gives *μυκώδη*. The *editio princeps* (Ald.), which appears to represent an authority independent of the MSS. now extant, has *ἐκτετραμμένοι κότινος ἔχων τὰ ἄνω μυχώδη*. *P.* (*Cod. Parisiensis*) agrees with Ald., except that it has *ἐκτετραμμένος*. Gaza's Latin version (1483), which is sometimes valuable as being made from a MS. no longer extant, has 'Flos quoque puniceae copiosus creberque est, denique amplitudinem sui quodam modo pomi aemulatur.

Parum se subtus attollens colligit et ambitu congruo sinuatim reddit,' which does not help much.

For ῥόδων Bodaeus conjectured ῥόδων, which is accepted by modern editors (Schneider, Wimmer), and seems necessary: Stackhouse however preferred ῥοδῶν, 'the rose-tree.' A similar corruption occurs in *H. P.* 3. 3. 5., where there can be no question that ῥόδῳ is right. (So Gaza, while Ald. has ῥόα.)

Otherwise Wimmer, the latest editor (*Didot*, Paris, 1866), prints as above, remarking *Vitium haerere in verbis* ἑτεροὶ δι' ὧν ὡς μικρὸν videtur.

I conjecture for these words—ἑτεροῖος, οἶος δῖωτος μικρὸς, and translate the whole:

'The flower of the pomegranate is produced abundantly and is solid. In general appearance it is a substantial structure with a flat top, like the flower of the rose; but, as seen from below, the inferior part of the flower is different-looking, being like a little two-eared jar turned on one side and having its rim indented.'

The words καὶ ὄλων—ῥόδων describe the corolla as seen from above, the words κάτωθεν—μυχώδη the undeveloped ovary, including the adherent calyx. This latter sentence explains incidentally why the pomegranate flower was called κύτινος (cf. *H. P.* 2. 6. 12. *C. P.* 1. 14. 4.; 2. 9. 3.; 2. 9. 9. *Diosc.* 1. 110. *Plin.* 23. 110.)—viz. because it resembled a κύτος (see *L. S. s.v.*). Theophrastus chooses the particular form of jar called δῖωτος because the indentations between the sepals suggest this: this is called ἐκτετραμμένος, because the weight of the developing fruit causes it to take up at one stage a horizontal position, like a jar lying on its side: χεῖλη refers of course to the jar (for the plural cf. the use of ἀντυγες), μυχώδη to the indentation in the calyx (a jar having presumably an unindented rim), ἔχων agrees with δῖωτος. δῖωτος does not seem to occur elsewhere as a substantive, but may well have existed: cf. Horace's *diota*: presumably δῖωτος agrees with ἀμφορεύς understood, *diota* with *amphora*.

II. *H. P.* 2. 8. 3. After describing the process of 'caprification'—viz. the fer-

tilisation of the cultivated fig by the gall-insect which comes out of the wild fig—the author adds a sentence on 'pseudo-caprification,' which runs thus in *U*:

Φασὶ δὲ ἐρινάξαι καὶ τὸ πόλιον καὶ ὁπότεν αἰγίπυρος ἢ πολὺς καὶ τοὺς τῆς πτελέας κυπαίρους (apparently corrected to κυπείρους).

The other MSS. omit καὶ before ὁπότεν: for κυπαίρους *MV* read κυπείρους, Ald. κύπεριν.

For αἰγίπυρος Wimmer admirably conjectures αὐτῷ καρπὸς, after Gaza, who renders *cum coriose fructificat*. For the mysterious κυπαίρους or κυπείρους he conjectures κυτάρους; but it is difficult to see how the word could be appropriate to the gall-bags of the elm leaf, which are doubtless what is here indicated. I suggest κωρύκους on this evidence: In *H. P.* 3. 14. 1. the elm is said to bear κωρυκίδες which contain gnat-like creatures; in *H. P.* 3. 15. 4. these growths are called κωρυκώδη τινα κοῖλα; in *H. P.* 3. 7. 3. the same thing is referred to as τὸ θυλακῶδες τοῦτο, where τοῦτο = 'the well-known': see also *H. P.* 9. 1. 2. where Schneider restores κωρύκω for ἀγγεῖω.

Translate: 'And they say that πόλιον also, when it fruits freely, and the gall-bags of the elm are used for caprification.'

Is it possible that τοῦτο, in the phrase τὸ θυλακῶδες τοῦτο quoted above, is deictic, and indicates that the lecturer (there seems good reason to think that the *Historia Plantarum* represents notes for or on lectures) held up a specimen? The usage is fairly common in this treatise—e.g., 3. 7. 3; 3. 18. 11; 4. 7. 1.

As to the possible occurrence of the word θώρυκος in *H. P.* 9. 1. 2. it is interesting to see Pliny's version of the passage: the writer gives a list of trees which produce a gummy substance, ending with the elm, and adds καὶ γὰρ αὕτη φέρει κομμί πλὴν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ φλοιοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἀγγεῖω. The last word Schneider ingeniously takes to be a gloss on κωρύκω: this is confirmed by Pliny's ludicrous mistranslation, which it also explains—*N. H.* 13. 11. § 67. (gum is found) *ulmo etiam in Coryco monte Ciliciae*. Pliny took κωρύκω to be a

proper name and added a geographical note! It appears that he had either this passage before him or *H. P.* 3. 14. 1. *ἐν ταῖς κωρυκίσι τὸ κομμί.* The blunder was detected by Bodaeus, who however points out that there was actually a mountain in *Pamphylia* called *Κώρυκος*: and Sir William Thiselton-Dyer informs me that one *wych-elm* (*ulmus montana*), the species most afflicted with leaf-galls, does grow in the Cilician Mountains: so that a case for Pliny might be made out.

(The word *κύτταρος*, which Wimmer wishes to restore here, is mysterious. In *H. P.* 3. 3. 8. it is the name given to the male flower of the pine, and the text is confirmed by a scholium on *Ar. Vesph.* 1111. *Θεόφραστος κυρίως λέγει κύτταρον τὴν προάνθησιν τῆς πίττυος.* But in what sense could this be called a 'cell'? In *H. P.* 4. 8. 7. the use is intelligible enough.)

III. *H. P.* 3. 18. 12. Description of *σμίλαξ*:

τὸν δὲ καρπὸν ἔχει προσεμφερῆ τῷ στῦχνῳ καὶ τῷ μηλώθρῳ καὶ μάλιστα τῇ καλουμένῃ σταφυλῇ ἀγρία· κατακρέμαστοι δ' οἱ βότρυες κιττοῦ τρόπον· *παρθριγκίζει* δὲ ὡς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν· ἀπὸ γὰρ ἐνὸς σημείου οἱ μίσχοι οἱ ῥαγικοί.

παρθριγκίζει is Wimmer's conjecture, but it seems impossible to supply, as he does, *τὰ ἄνθη τὸν καυλόν*, and he gives up *ὡς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν*. In the MSS. the sentence runs thus:

Cod. Urbinas παρωγγύζει δὲ παραθρινακίζει δὲ ὡς.

Codd. Medicus and Vindobonensis παραγγίζει δὲ παραθρινακίζει δὲ ὡς.

The Aldine edition has *παρεγγύζει δὲ ὡς*. Gaza's version is *verum ad labruscam propius accedunt*, whence Schneider conjectured *παρεγγίζουσι δὲ μᾶλλον*. It looks as though *παρεγγίζει* δέ was right, and the gibberish which follows in the MSS. concealed some unusual noun, the subject of *παρεγγίζει*: ὡς perhaps conceals its termination -ος: the missing noun should mean 'setting' or 'arrangement' of the berries. Now just below we have *ἴδιον δὲ τὸ τῶν βοτρυῶν, ὅτι ἐκ πλαγίων τε τὸν καυλὸν παραθριγκίζουσιν καὶ κατ' ἄκρον ὁ μέγιστος βότρυς τοῦ καυλοῦ* ('a peculiarity of the clusters is that they make a row along the sides of the stalk, and the largest cluster is at the end of the stalk'), where *παρθριγκίζουσιν* is Schneider's certain restoration for *παρθρινακίζουσιν*, *παρθριγγίζουσι* of MSS. (*παρθριγγίζουσι* Ald.).

I suggest, then, *παρεγγίζει δὲ ὁ παραθριγκισμὸς πρὸς τὴν σταφυλὴν*.

'The fruit is like that of nightshade and bryony, and most of all like the berry which is called the "wild grape." The clusters hang down as in the ivy, but the regular setting of the berries resembles the grape-cluster more closely: for the stalklets which bear the berries start from a single point.'

ARTHUR F. HORT.

Harrow.

THE WATERFOWL GODDESS PENELOPE AND HER SON PAN.

WE have recently been told that German results are accepted too readily. That is notoriously true of the Greek epic, and it has come nigh to be the undoing of Homer. It may well be applied to the work of the 'Saga-displacement' school in Germany, whose *métier* it was to make plausible, if startling, cases by stringing together a number of weakly indications in history, saga or story, and then saying Q.E.D. without a proper scrutiny of the credentials of the

authorities or the quality of the evidence adduced. Thus it was, for example, that the Trojan War became a struggle on Greek soil and Hector a Boeotian. Otto Crusius invalidated these speculations to some purpose, Andrew Lang and others helped, and they passed out of fashion. But they have proved useful in this country for the traditional-book theory of the epic. Several instances are embedded in Professor Murray's *R.G.E.*, and Mr. Thomson inclines to the same style of

demonstration in his companion volume. As an example, the evidence on which he concludes that Penelopé was a waterfowl goddess of Mantinea is briefly examined below. The copious literature will be found quoted in Pauly-Wissowa, Roscher, and Gruppe.

First, at Mantinea, where there were a number of graves of heroes and heroines, one mound was pointed out to Pausanias as Penelopé's. She had come to Mantinea, by way of Sparta, when turned out of house and home by Odysseus as a bad lot. Pausanias does not appear to think much of this story, for he notes a conflict with the *Thesprōtis*, and immediately afterwards disbelieves a similar tale of the Mantineans about Maera. To Mr. Thomson it is a 'memory of Penelopé as an ancient goddess of the land.' But this village talk really negatives divinity. *Non vera patet dea*; surely the character given Penelopé is enough. And then the mound. Some gods did shuffle off their immortal coils, generally for a time only, but I have not been able so far to find a case of a deity being laid to permanent rest like a mere mortal in an *ἀνδρόκμητος* tumulus. Pausanias, I think, mentions no such case, and he does not say there was worship or sacrifice at Penelopé's mound. Eugammon's story that Circé made her immortal is also against her divine origin.

But 'divine Penelopé must be' because she was the mother of Pan. Is that necessarily so? Semelé and Leda were not, I think, divine, to Greek story at least, whatever they may be now to scientific anthropo-mythologists. And was she mother of Pan? According to some accounts a Penelopé was, but sometimes she is a Nymph of that name, and Pan is *νυμφαγενής*. Other versions gave other mothers. Mr. Thomson's statement of the case is inadequate and not un-biassed. He chiefly relies on a parenthetical remark of Herodotus (one of those *λεγόμενα* which the historian says he is bound to report, *πείθεσθαι γέ μὲν οὐ παντάσῃ*), and the authorities who favour the view Mr. Thomson does not like are said not to 'count.' He even sets aside the Hymn to Pan

because it is bound to follow 'Homer.' But what then? It is the rule for the Hymns to follow 'Homer.' Most people will think, I feel sure, that the Hymn would be the very best evidence in a paternity proceeding. Some of the witnesses, none apparently earlier than Pindar (as reported by Servius; but a different account is also attributed to the poet), do seem to mean our Penelopé, but there are a number of other claimants, and Pan's variety of parentage deserves a paper to itself.

Again, Odysseus himself had a connection with Mantinea, and it was there, it is suggested, that he 'met' the waterfowl goddess and married her. The Mantinean connection is argued from the fact that he came there, an oar on his shoulder, to find, by order of Teiresias, people who did not know the sea and ate food without salt. When he found them, he was to sacrifice to Poseidon. This oracle, Mr. Thomson says confidently, 'conceals some historical fact,' to wit, 'the foundation of a cult of Poseidon in some inland place remote from the sea,' but he cannot really know this. Mantinea is selected as the place in question on the authority of a paper by Svoronos, which is, on the whole, a careful statement of the evidence. He and Mr. Thomson reject the belief of the ancients that Epirus was meant, partly on Eustathius' *vetus locus* about the *βαρβαρόφωνοι δοῦπτοι* of the names of the towns mentioned, and partly because Epirus had a seaboard.¹ But these are small matters compared with the insuperable difficulty attaching to Mantinea. It is not reasonable to ask us to believe that Odysseus tramped through Elis and over nearly the whole breadth of Arcadia, leaving its secluded central mountains severely alone, and did not find what he sought till he came to its eastern border, at a place only twenty miles from the sea (which must be visible from its hills in the atmosphere of S. Greece nearly every day of the year), and with two tracks to the Gulf at Argos. The Mantineans may, like

¹ There is much to be said for it. But would any place in Greece suit? Libya's claims have been urged. Kretschmer is satisfied with Epirus.

the Arcadians generally, have had no concern with *θαλάσσια ἔργα*, as Mr. Thomson quotes from the *Catalogue*, but that they did not know the sea and did not use its salt is quite incredible.

Yet again, Didymus and scholiasts preserve as names once borne by Penelopé, Ameiraké (Amirakis, Amerakis), Arnakia (Anarkia), Arnea and Arnaia. The two last and, somewhat rashly, the second, Mr. Thomson thinks *may* mean 'she of Arné,' and this Arné *may* be a spring of that name near Mantinea, unknown to fame save for one story. The possibility is held to confirm Mantinean connection, and to suggest that Penelopé was a waterfowl goddess, though there is nothing in the notices that points to a spring or to Penelopé's divinity. But I find that three ladies among her earthly ancestors bore the name of Arné (sometimes spelt Arené), that there was a man Arnaios in Ithaca, and that there was an Arnaios or Arneios in the family into which Penelopé's uncle Tyndareos married. As to the origin of these names, no one seems to have discussed it till now,¹ a derivation of Arnea from ἀρνέισθαι, though supported by an oracle, being evidently folk-etymology. There may be a connection with ἄρνα, oppidum or arx, which is thought to be prehellénic. That with the spring Arné is a mere possibility till Penelopé's relation to it is established or inferable *aliunde*.

Various explanations of her name have been given, but none better than those based on the famous Web. She, like the homonymous Nymph, is *Weberin*. Fick formerly derived it from the bird πηνέλοψ, but changed to the interpretation *Geewebe auflösend*. Solmsen has recently returned to the bird, and Mr. Thomson approves. There was a story that Penelopé was once rescued by πηνέλοπες when flung into the sea, and this 'proves that the Greeks'—some of them—'connected Πηνελόπη with πηνέλοψ.' Her rescue from the sea by marsh birds described of old as 'like a duck, but the size of a pigeon' is not merely 'a quaint myth'; it is a story so absurd that

folk-etymology is suggested at once. Mr. Thomson finds support in the fact that Penelopé is sometimes represented in art with a *pēnelops* beside her. If the *pēnelops* has been finally identified as a mallard or widgeon or some other species—Professor D'Arcy Thompson only gives 'a kind of Wild Duck or Goose'—and Mr. Thomson knows that the bird drawn by the vase-painters is of that species, there is no more to be said. But can he be sure on those points? Does not one of Penelopé's pet geese (καί τέ σφιν λαίνομαι εἰσορόωσα, *Od.* xix. 537) suit equally well, as the dog Argos does for pictures of the Foot-washing?

The argument here breaks away to the analogy of the Stymphalian Artemis, who is also said to be a waterfowl *koré*, though her *Wesen*, like that of most other gods and heroes nowadays, takes many other forms. The analogy with Artemis is not new, but the statement is long and involved, and I am not concerned with it. The evidence that Penelopé was a Mantinean goddess is doubtful in every particular. The strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, and if every link is weak, the chain is weak indeed.

It is easy to see how the story that Penelopé died at Mantinea *may* have arisen. A connection with Pan once started, her expulsion by her husband and her removal to the seat of her own family in Lacedaemon, and thence to one of the principal places in Pan's Arcadia, would easily follow, and a mound for her burial-place also. But how did the relationship to Pan start in vulgar minds? May not that again be referable to folk-etymology?—of which, as of superior philology, one may say with the French savant, *que de sottises il nous faut avaler en ton nom!* Can anyone who has seen the form Πανελόπα doubt that this is a reasonable explanation? The folk ἐφλάρουν, to use Tzetzes' word, with the lady's name as they did later with the god's.² Gruppe suggests that Πάν is a Kurz-

¹ I now see that Goerres suggests 'robber' for Ameiraké, comparing Athené Ἀητίς. He gives no authority, and we are not helped.

² He became the symbol of the universe, τὸ πᾶν. The Hymn makes him the *all*-gladdening. He owed his origin to *all* the Wooers. Possibly Panticapaeum, Panea and Pandosia owed their cults to their names.

form for Πανέλοπος (of which δασύπους, appropriate of Pan, might be a possible interpretation) through Πάνελος, a name that does occur. But that is doubtful, and an original Πάων, though it has the high sanction of Drs. Farnell and Roscher, and though the form is supported by an inscription, has not satisfied all. It is curious that the schol. and Eustath. on *Il.* xxiii. 762, by connecting Πάν with πηνίον, πανίον, brings us round again to Penelopé. Gruppe says these words may be from an original *πάν = *σπάν, *Spinnhhar*. It looks as if the mythologists should pause, in regard to the Pan-Penelopé connection, till the philologists reconsider the names of the heroine and the god.

The monstrous regiment of folk-etymologists went very far. The shameless, lustful Wooers being ready to hand in the saga, or in the *märchen*

welded into it, first one and then another was dragged in, and finally there was that φαυλεπίφανλον invention that Pan ἐκ πάντων (μνηστήρων) ἐσπάρη, *sicut ipsum nomen Pan videtur declarare* (Servius)—a startling contrast this to the Great Pan of later ages! He was, it may be observed, late in coming into his kingdom as a respectable god. In early days he was but a sprite of the Arcadian wilds, and ἐβαρβάρωτο χρόνιος ὢν ἐν Ἀρκασίῳ. Things were said of him in his unregenerate character which make us wonder the less that a nasty explanation of his origin was accepted by some people. The Hymn shows a better way. But for all those who refuse to believe that Homer and Hesiod are late and Athenian and vamped up, there is no necessity for any special vouchers for the character of περίφρων Πηνελόπεια.

A. SHEWAN.

IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.¹

I. iii. 35-6.

tandem te nostro referens iniuria lecto
alterius clausis expulit e foribus.

The first clue to the understanding of this is in IV. viii. 27:

cum fieret nostro toties iniuria lecto.

A conjugal infidelity is the 'outrage.' 'Has the other woman's outrage kicked you out?' is the gist of Cynthia's question.

But what does *te referens nostro lecto* mean? A dative of place whither? They say so. *Clamor caelo*, etc. Let them say. A small correction in that part of the verse, where the very rhythm betrays something amiss, will mend all. For *tandem* read *tene vicem*.

tene vicem nostro referens iniuria lecto
. . . expulit.

Has *her* outrage, *vicem referens nostro lecto* avenging my (outraged) bed
vicem referre = *ulcisci* is Ovidian.

at, puto, non poterat ipsa referre vicem?
Ars. i. 370.

¹ Continued from *Classical Review*, vol. xxviii., Nos. 1 and 3.

I wish *eadem referre* were attested in the same sense (as ταῦτ' εἰσφέρειν in Greek, e.g. Dem. *Mid.* 101), but I cannot find an instance. Palaeographically it would be easier than *vicem*; but an Irish *ic* is easily mis-read as a *d*. *Te*, I take it, was then interpolated to stop the gap of a syllable and to supply an object for *referens*.

There still remains the difficulty of *expulit ex clausis foribus*. Lachmann's *aspulit* seems the best correction.

I. x. 2.

O iucunda quies, primo cum testis amori
affueram vestris conscius in lacrimis!

Probably *thalamis*, as Huschke conjectured.

I. xiii. 21-24.

non sic Haemonio Salmonida mixtus Enipeo
Taenarius facili pressit amore deus,
nec sic caelestem flagrans amor Herculis Heben
sensit in Oetaeis gaudia prima iugis.

tantus . . . *inter utrosque furor* will suggest to anyone who is intimate with Propertian refinements that, of the two mythological testimonies adduced, one

will offer the male as grammatical subject of the sentence, the other the female. This antecedent probability that *Hebe* and not *Heben* should be read in 23 is confirmed by the harshness of *amor Herculis sensit gaudia* for *amans Hercules sensit gaudia*. This is usually defended by the alleged parallel of *quae miser error perpessus Herculis flevrat* in I. xx. 15, 16, but the change of *error* into *erro* cures that passage (cf. *Classical Review*, vol. xxiv., p. 213, 1910). There is nothing harsh or strange about *amor Herculis Hebe sensit gaudia prima*—‘Hebe beloved of Hercules tasted her first joys.’ But what of *caelestem*? No epithet is to be expected: it unbalances the verse. What is required is a predicate or adverb to correspond with the *facili* of the other district. What Propertius finds so remarkable in the case is the unembarrassed readiness and entrain of the couple.

Read then :

nec sic *confestim* flagrans amor Herculis Hebe
sensit in Oetaeis gaudia prima iugis.

I. xvi. 5-12.

5 nunc ego nocturnis pоторum saucia rixis
6 pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus ;
9 nec possum infamis dominae defendere noctes
10 nobilis obscenis tradita carminibus ;
7 et mihi non desunt turpes pendere corollae
8 semper et exclusi signa iacere faces ;
11 nec tamen illa suae revocatur parcere famae
12 turpior et saeculi vivere luxuria.

The transposition of 9-10 and 7-8 gives meaning to *nec tamen* (= *cum tamen non*), but the grave question remains: what to make of v. 12.

Lachmann took a short way, by bastardising the couplet; Baehrens read *purior et saeculi*; Rothstein justifies the text by one of the thousand thousand pieces of exegesis which have for their common unavowed major premiss that Latins breathed Baltic fog and not clear Mediterranean air for their climate. For *saeculi* Heinsius conjectured *segni*—surely an anticlimax after *infamis noctes*.

Let it be noted that—

1. A quadrisyllabic ending such as *luxuria* especially requires an attribute to balance it in the first hemistich.

2. *vivere* requires a word of verbal force to give it construction.

The second half of the verse is in no way suspect; it agrees with the type—

et non ignota vivere nequitia (II. v. 2).

The two wanting elements must, then, be conjecturally recovered out of *turpior et saeculi*. *turpior et*, I guess, should be <s>*tuprorum*.

The word *stupra* in such a context falls pat enough, e.g.—

nam nil *stupra* valet nihil tacere

in Catull. vi. 12 (generally accepted since Scaliger).

Vistilia praetoria familia genita licentiam *stupri*
apud aediles vulgaverat.

Tac. Ann. II. 85.

Palaeographically the change is not violent: an initial lost, and the *per compendium* symbol for *et* and *-um* confused. An attribute found for *luxuria*, it remains to find the verbal hinge of the construction. I had thought of *stuprorumque sedet vivere luxuria*, ‘She is determined to live,’ etc. But the context seems to disqualify the solemnity of the impersonal *sedet*. The adjective *facilis* fits the place better. It is a favourite with Propertius in the sense of easy morals.

Haemonio Salmonida mixtus Enipeo.

Taenarius *facili* pressit amore deus (I. xiii. 22).

seu *facili* totum ducit amore diem (I. xiv. 10).

quod si tam *facilis* spiraret Cynthia nobis
(II. xxiv. 5).

non ego tam *facilis* (II. xxix. 33).

For the added infinitive cf.—

facilis cedere lympa (I. xi. 12).

facilis spargi rosa (IV. viii. 40).

faciles aurem praebere puellae (II. xxi. 15).

Read then :

nec tamen illa suae revocatur parcere famae,
stuprorum facilis vivere luxuria.

‘And, all the time, nothing recalls her to a sense of decency: she takes so readily to the life of *splendeurs de courtisanes*.’

I. xvi. 38.

te non ulla meae laesit petulantia linguae,
quae solet irato dicere tota loco.

Accepting Beroaldus’ *tuta* for *tota*, perhaps one needs no heroic remedies for this passage. Just as Phaedrus in

Fab. I. xxviii. 7, *tuta quippe ipso loco*, supports that reading, so another phrase in Phaedrus supports *ignoto* for *irato*. *Fab.* xiv.:

malus cum sutor inopia deperditus
medicinam *ignoto* facere coepisset loco.

Being a stranger, the lover can speak without restraint.

quae solet ignoto dicere tuta loco.

II. iii. 1.

qui nullum tibi dicebas iam posse nocere
haesisti : cecidit spiritus iste tuus.

That *nullum* should be in the MSS., and not *nihilum* or *nullam* is surely a very singular thing. *Nullam* and *nihilum* (Heinsius and Scaliger) have usually been adopted. But is not this verse yet another case of the confusions arising from the spelling *vocare* = *vacare* (cf. II. xxvi. 54 and IV. ii. 19, where *vacans* had passed into *vorans*¹)? Read

qui <p>aullum tibi dicebas iam posse *vocare*.
Cf.

liber eram et vacuo meditabar vivere lecto
in the preceding elegy.

Whether (and, if so, why) Propertius wrote *qui paullum tibi dicebas*, and not *qui tibi dicebas paullum*, is another question.

II. ix. 13.

foedavitque comas et tanti corpus Achillis
maximaque in parva sustulit ossa manu
(Achilli O Achillis *cett.*)

Briseis did not pick up the dead Achilles bodily: after cremation remains no *corpus*, but bones and ashes. The couplet has these two vices: the intolerable repetition of Achilles' name from v. 9, and the want of a word for ashes. Read Lucan *Phars.* ix. 55-62 (it is Cornelia's regrets that she has been denied the privilege of giving the last rites to Pompey's body), and the solution appears.

ergo indigna fui, dixit, Fortuna, marito
accendisse rogam, gelidosque effusa per artus
incubuisse vivo? Laceros exurere crines
membraque dispersi pelago componere Magni?

¹ By the way, Broukhuyzen mentions that the Codex Borrichianus gives *vocabis* for *vacabis* at II. xxxii. 7 = II. xxiii. 37 of his numbering.

volneribus cunctis largos infundere fletus?
ossibus et tepida vestes implere *favilla*,
quidquid ab extincto licuisset tollere busto,
in templis sparsura deum?

Ossa and *favilla* are what remain after cremation.

The initial *f* of *favilla* became attached as an *f* to the preceding word, leaving what in such a context was most likely to be read as a case of the name *Achilles*. Of the remaining *corpu*, I would make either *curva* or *incurva*. She stoops with the burden of carrying *tanti favillam*.

foedavitque comas et tanti curva favillam
maximaque in parva sustulit ossa manu.

The picturesque epithet would describe the stooping gesture of one who carries a heavy weight (*sc.*, an urn) in both hands. Such, I believe, is the true interpretation of IV. vii. 25:

denique quis nostro *curvum* te funere vidit?

II. xxii. 39, 40.

aut si forte irata meo sit facta ministro
ut sciat esse aliam quae velit esse mea.

For *meo ministro* Baehrens conjectured *deo sinistro*; but *meo ministro* is appropriate enough, and the Latinity shows that the fault lies elsewhere. Why *sit facta irata*? It is no more classical for *sit irata* than *fio iratus* would be for *irascor*.

Read

aut si forte irata meo *sint fata* ministro
ut sciat esse aliam, etc.

It is the slave who is described as 'having no luck' when his errand fails. (The dialogue between Parmeno and Gnatho in *Eunuchus* 275-290 illustrates the position; or, still better, Bacchis' threat to Syrus in *Hautontimorumenos*, 724-8.) And it is the slave who is to know that, in the unlucky event of a rebuff in the ordinary quarter, there is a second string to his master's bow.

II. xxvi. 23, 4.

non si Cambysae redeant et flumina Croesi
dicat 'de nostro surge, poeta, toro.'

Cambyses was never proverbial for riches, and his name has generally been held for an interpolation in this line. Guyet conjectured *Candaulae*; Bur-

mann, *iam Cyri* and subsequently *iam Gygae* (which has enjoyed the approval of Schrader and of Rothstein); Vahlen, *Cambletae*; Postgate and Housman, *gaza Midae*.

If another name was in the verse at all, it can hardly fail to have been either that of Gyges or that of Midas; but the *et* is awkwardly misplaced—not without precedent, but still awkwardly; and the palaeographical probability does not come very kindly to meet the logical, in support of *gaza Midae*.

Supposing Croesus alone to be cited as the typical millionaire prince, as he is cited alone in III. v. 17:

Lydus Dulichio non distat Croesus ab Iro,

and III. xviii. 28:

Croesum aut Pactoli quas parit umor opes,

another common noun to match *flumina* must be discovered under the letters *cambise*: *et* will thus be normal. Plainly the word must mean riches, treasures, or the like.

Now the authorities mostly mention Croesus' *θησαυροί*, treasury-vaults: e.g., Herodotus IV. 126, Pseudo-Plutarch *de Fluviis* VII. (ed. Didot, vol. v., p. 85). The Latin for *θησαυροί* is *favisae*, a word explained by Varro apud Aul. Gell. *Noctes Att.* II. 10, whose explanation reappears in Paulus *Exc. e Festo* s.v. Propertius may have written

non si favisae redeant et flumina Croesi.

The conjecture postulates the confusion between *b* and *v* which I have already pointed out in III. vii. 45 (*viveret*: *biberet*) and IV. ii. 34 (*favor*: *fabor*): see *Classical Review*, vol. xxviii., pp. 11 and 81. Given that the copyist had *fabiſe* before him and *Croesus* in the context, it seems not unlikely that he would read it as *cābiſe*=*Cambyſae*. A rare and archaic word like *favisae* had little chance of surviving.

But I do not know that the *a* can be long if the *o* of *fovea* is short. The word is not cited from any verse.

III. vi. 37, 38.

et mea cum multis lacrimis mandata reporta:
'iram non fraudes esse in amore meo.'

Thus codd. et edd. vulgo, by the carelessness which allows one to read nonsense ninety-nine times over until, the hundredth time, it dawns. For the sense requires, and the rule of the metre prefers, that the possessive adjective shall be predicate to *iram* and *fraudes*. Cf. Terence, *Haut.* 782:

Sv. non ego dicebam in perpetuum ut illam illi dares,
verum ut similes. CH. non meast simulatio.

Read

iram, non fraudes, esse in amore meam.

The phrase *in amore*, which had the special charm of corresponding syllabically as well as in sense with Callimachus *ἐν ἔρωτι* (*Anth. Pal.* V. 53), recurs several dozen times in Books I.-III.: of these in only two is it apparently qualified by a possessive, viz.:

nunc in amore tuo cogor habere notam.

I. xviii. 8.

namque in amore suo semper sua maxima cuique

nescioquo pacto verba nocere solent.

II. xxv. 31.

In the latter *suo*=*propitio*, a common enough idiom; in the former, if *tuo* be sound, it represents an objective genitive. But is it sound? There is a second converging reason for thinking *tuo* corrupt.

The phrase *habere notam* is very rare, but not doubtful in meaning: e.g. *et collo blandi dentis habere notam*—'to have the mark,' Ov. *Am.* I. vii. 42.

It is also a medical term (like *notam exhibere*) for 'showing symptoms': as in Celsus III. ii. in longis quoque morbis etiam tales notas non habentibus.' But without the defining *dentis* and *tales* each sentence would be meaningless. Phaedrus has 'a quo repulsus tristem sustinuit notam' (*Fab.* I. iii. 11). The phrase is never used of censorial reprobation; and even if (*per impossibile*) it were for *notatus sum infamia quod te amem*, that would give no antithesis to the hexameter.

Wanted: the genitive case of a word to indicate the opposite of *inter felices amantes numerari*.

The man 'whom no girl will look at' is a defined type in antiquity. Venus has

a grudge against him: he is ἀναφρόδιτος (cf. Arist. *Ran.* 1045). Pamphilus in Ter. *Andr.* 245 complains:

adeone hominem esse *invenustum* aut *infelicem* quemquam ut ego sum!

inamabilis and *illepidus* are so used in Plaut. *Bacch.* 615.

None of these gives a noun whose genitive is metrically possible to be attached to *notam* in our present problem; but there is yet another adjective to express the same idea of 'fatally lacking in charm'—*inamoenus*.

Suppose Propertius wrote—

qui modo felices inter numerabar amantes,
nunc *inamoenitiae* cogor habere notam,

he would have written a word which would readily enough be read as *in amore tuo* or *tuac*, but a word which alas our lexicons have failed to preserve. I hear Robinson Ellis's ghost murmur, 'More than hazardous.' . . .

The article on *amoenus* in the new Thesaurus shows how commonly the word was applied to persons in popular language, as evidenced by inscriptions. The noun is strictly formed on the analogy of *inimicitia*.

III. viii. 29, 30.

dulcior ignis erat Paridi cum grata per arma
Tyndaridi poterat gaudia ferre suae.

(I assume *grata* as a certainty, since *gratia* makes nonsense: 'the battle of pleasure,' not 'the Greek battle,' is meant.)

ferre gaudia is a phrase never used by Catullus or Tibullus, once by Virgil with characteristic slyness of allusion:

'quo fugis, Aenea? thalamos ne desere pactos;
hac dabitur dextra tellus quaesita per undas.'

talìa vociferans sequitur strictumque coruscat
mucronem, nec *ferre* videt sua *gaudia* ventos.
Aen. X. 649-652.

and by Propertius here only. His

quanta ego praeterita *collegi gaudia* nocte
(II. xiv. 9),

is a little different.

But there are at least seven instances of it in Ovid which all agree in one meaning, viz. *to take pleasure* not *to give pleasure*.

They are as follows:

- (1) hac fruar: haec de te gaudia sola feram.
Her. xii. 22.
- (2) sperando certe gaudia magna feram.
Am. II. ix. 44.
- (3) protinus ex facili gaudia ferre licet.
Rem. 522.
- (4) hoc et in abducta Briseide flebat Achilles,
illam Plisthenio gaudia ferre toro.
Rem. 778.
- (5) gaudia quanta tuli! quam me manifesta
libido
contigit! ut iacui totis resoluta medullis!
Metam. ix. 483.
- (6) quantaque vis avido gaudia corde feras.
Trist. III. xi. 58.
- (7) quaeque est in vobis pietas alterna feretis
gaudia, tu fratris fascibus, ille tuis.
Ex Ponto IV. ix. 62.

In *Her.* xviii. 43 for

gaudia rapturo si quis tibi claudere vellet
aerios aditus,

Heinsius read

gaudia laturo.

If *gaudia ferre* is a set phrase for *to take pleasure* it can evidently never be constructed with a dative, and we must beware (as not all commentators have been) of taking *Plisthenio toro* in (4) and *fascibus* in (7) for anything but ablatives. The person of whom the pleasure is taken, can be expressed (where necessary to be expressed at all) by an ablative, as in (7); by *de*, as in (1); by *ex*, as in (3).

Though Ovid furnishes no example of a genitive, yet, since *ferre* = φέρειν, a genitive is as logical and natural with *gaudia ferre* as with *spolium* or *spolia ferre* which = *spolia capere* just as it = *gaudia capere*. Cf. Val. Flacc. IV. 164:

Hesionam et Phrygiae peteret cum gaudia
nuptae.

Read therefore

Tyndaridís poterat gaudia ferre suae
as Burmann records the codex Regius
alter (Parisinus) read.

III. x. 27.

sit sors et nobis talorum interprete iactu
quem gravibus pennis verberet ille puer.

Four hundred and twenty-seven years ago Beroaldus remarked that *gravius* was the right reading; but the habits of

scholarship are very like the habits of the scriptural sow, and Beroaldus' certain emendation has been merely recorded as a curiosity by Burmann and Baehrens. Strange that a poet whose text has received the attentions of such Latinists as Heinsius, Broukhuyzen, and Lachmann should still present such a blemish. But Broukhuyzen was content to observe that the phrase was a metaphor from cockfighting, and leave it at that. And Lachmann's therapeutic rays flashed fitfully.

Everybody knows that in Latin elegiacs (except as written by school-boys), as a rule, noun and epithet stand on opposite sides of the pentameter caesura; yet one may hardly appreciate how infinitesimal are the exceptions to this rule in Propertius, unless by taking a census. I believe the following is a complete list. (Pronouns are of course a different category, and so are adjectives when constructed as predicate. I am merely concerned with the poet's practice where the adjective is decorative but not significant.)

- (1) nudus Amor formae non amat artificem (I. ii. 8).
- (2) sanguinis et cari vincula rupit amor (I. xv. 16).
- (3) montibus Etruscis, haec sciat esse mea (I. xxi. 10).
- (4) Caesare sub magno cura secunda fores (II. i. 26).
- (5) Gorgonis anguiferae pectus operta comis (II. ii. 8).
- (6) pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus (II. x. 24).
- (7) et levibus curis magna perire bona (II. xii. 4).
- (8) auribus et puris scripta probasse mea (II. xiii. 12).
- (9) maxima praeda tibi maxima cura mihi (II. xvi. 2).
- (10) fallaci dominae me pudet esse iocum (II. xxiv. 16).
- (11) candida Nesae caerulea Cymothoe (II. xxvi. 16).
- (12) votivas noctes et mihi solvem decem (II. xxviii. 61).
- (Postgate's punctuation eliminates this instance.)
- (13) communis culpa cur reus unus agor? (II. xxx. 32).
- (14) Silenique senes et pater ipse chori (II. xxxii. 38).

- (15) agricolae domini carpere delicias (II. xxxiv. 74).
- (16) nec Iovis Elei caelum imitata domus (III. ii. 20).
- (17) carminis heroi tangere iussit opus (III. iii. 16).
- (18) octipedis Cancrī terga sinistra time (IV. i. 150).
- (19) concordique toro pessima semper avis (IV. v. 6).
- (20) litibus alternis quos putet esse datos (IV. v. 40).
- (21) codicis immundi vincula sentit anus (IV. vii. 44).
- (22) tergeminusque canis sic mihi molle sonet (IV. vii. 52).
- (23) et manibus duris apta puella fui (IV. ix. 50).

When from these twenty-three you have deducted the instances where the adjective *defines* and not merely *describes* (Nos. 3, 14, 16, 17, 22), those where it is quasi-predicative in force (1, 10, 13); the Graecising or other peculiar effects (9, 11); those where the text is hardly above suspicion (5, 8, 15), the remainder is so extremely small—about 10 pentameters in 2,000—as to make each case *prima facie* suspect. And be it observed that Book III. offers only two instances at all, and in both these the adjective plainly defines, not decorates. One would not damn such examples as Nos. 6, 7, 18, 19, etc., unless the suspicion were corroborated from another quarter; but in our example it has cumulative value. For in the couplet

sit sors et nobis talorum interprete iactu
quem gravibus pennis verberet ille puer

there are already symptoms of disease: *et* is unmeaning, or, at the best, unaccountably misplaced; and *nobis* can hardly in reason refer to any but Propertius and Cynthia. What Beroaldus' correction entails is the further change of *et* into *e*; *quem* is for *utrum*. *Quem e nobis* = 'which of us two,' *gravius verberet Amor*. Cf. Ovid *Ars*. I. 204:

nam deus e vobis alter es, alter eris.

This fond pastime for a *tête-à-tête* birthday party is best illustrated by Catullus XLV., in which first Septimius makes his protestation, *mea Acme, nite perdit amo*, etc., and then Acme

makes hers: *she* is more in love than he is.

ut multo *mihi* maior acriorque
ignis mollibus ardet in medullis.

(To take the comparative as meaning 'more than ever before' is a beastly

suggestion, and, besides, destroys the point of *mollibus*.)

Here the amorous debate is referred to the arbitrament of Heads-or-tails.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University College, Glasgow.

NOTE ON OVID, *TRISTIA* III. 6. 8 (AUGUSTUS ET IUPPITER).

IN the January number of the *Classical Quarterly* Professor Housman has a piquant note on this line, which not only amused but greatly interested me. It seemed to have a bearing on the cult of Augustus in his lifetime; and I at once turned out the eight passages which he quotes from the *Tristia*, and examined them carefully in order to find out why after his exile Ovid should refer to Augustus as Iuppiter. So far as I know, he was not in the habit of doing this in his earlier works. Incidentally, too, I was curious to know whether Professor Housman's correction of the last word of the line (*Ioui* for *uiro*) would convince me after I had examined his passages. It did entirely convince me on a first reading of his note.

Ovid is writing to a friend, and tells him that their friendship was a well-known fact at Rome; it was not hidden under a bushel.

Quique est in caris animi tibi candor amicis
Cognita sunt ipsi, quem colis, ista *uiro*.

That is, it was well known also to Augustus. No commentator seems to have doubted this; and Heinsius, thinking that *uiro* might mean anyone in Rome, suggested *deo* instead of *uiro*. Professor Housman goes further, and would read *Ioui*, pointing out that Ovid often refers to Augustus as Iuppiter (though not in the nominative) in this very work. The Apollinism of Augustus is perhaps a little overworn of late, and his relation to Iuppiter undervalued: is any light thrown on the latter by these passages? Let me quote them in full.

I. 1. 81:

Uitaret caelum Phaethon, si uiueret, et quos
Optaret stulte, tangere nollet equos.
Me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iouis arma timere.
Me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.

Here it is plain that Ovid starts his *Tristia* thinking of himself as Phaethon and of Augustus as Iuppiter. He had been telling the story of Phaethon not long before (*Met.* II.), and to think mythologically of his own catastrophe was probably a relief to him. The 'image' remains in his brain.

I. 4. 26 (written during a storm in the Adriatic, which seems to be driving him towards the forbidden Italian coast):

Parcite, caerulei uos saltem numina ponti,
Infestumque mihi sit satis esse Iouem.

The same image is in his head: he has been the victim of Jove's bolt, is he to be also the victim of Neptune's wrath? (Note that Augustus is vaguely alluded to as *deo* in l. 22.)

I. 5. 77:

Cumque minor Ioue sit tumidis qui regnat in
undis,
Illum Neptuni, me Iouis ira premit.

Still the idea of thunderbolt: cf 'me deus oppressit' in l. 75. He is comparing himself with Odysseus, who escaped this but was worried by Neptune.

III. 1. 38. Here for the first time we have a different poetical idea. His poem is imagined finding its way to the house of Augustus and the temple of Apollo with its library. On its way it passes the temple of Iuppiter Stator, and when it gets to the *domus Augusti* it naïvely asks if this too is not a temple of Iuppiter? Is not that the oak crown of the god over the gate? (really the *corona ciuica* of Augustus):

Non fallimur, inquam,
Et magni uerum est hanc Iouis esse domum.

But this is only a pretty passing

thought: at the end of the poem it is forgotten again:

Caesar ades uoto maxime diue meo!

III. 5. 7. The original image again: writing to a friend who had been good to him in his misfortune, he says:

Ausus es igne Iouis percussum tangere corpus.

III. 11. 62. An exact equivalent of I. 5. 77, quoted above.

IV. 3. 69. The thunderbolt again:

Nec tibi, quod saevis ego sum Iouis ignibus
ictus,
Purpureus molli fiat in ore rubor.

V. 2. 46. At first sight this looks like a genuine equation of Augustus and Iuppiter, *i.e.* one without mythological fancy:

Adloquor en absens absentia numina supplex,
Si fas est homini cum Ioue posse loqui.

But reading on for a few lines we find that Ovid is still thinking of Phaethon:

Parce, precor, minimamque tuo de fulmine
partem Deme!

So too in *Ex Ponto* I. 7. 49:

At grauitur cecidi. Quid enim mirabile si quis
A Ioue percussus non leue volnus habet?

I may add *Tristia* II. 215, just to show that in this same *Tristia* Ovid can distinguish Augustus from Iuppiter and compare the two:

Utque deos caelumque simul sublime tuenti
Non uacat exiguis rebus adesse Ioui,
Ex te pendentem sic dum circumpicis orbem,
Effugiunt curas inferiora tuas?

Lastly, let me quote a passage in which Ovid's real attitude to Iuppiter slips out even in his *Tristia*: II. 289: (cf. *Ars. Am.* I. 631):

Quis locus est templis augustior? Haec quoque
uitet
In culpam si qua est ingeniosa suam.

Cum steterit Iouis aede, Iouis succurret in aede
Quam multas matres fecerit ille deus.

It is by this time quite clear to me, and I hope will be to my readers, that Ovid is very far from seriously identifying Augustus with Iuppiter: it is only his poetical mind and the story of Phaethon that leads him, as Professor Housman cautiously puts it (p. 38), to *denote* Augustus by oblique cases of Iuppiter. (I can imagine why he should avoid the nominative, though I find it hard to express the feeling.) This being so, the substitution of *Ioui* for *uiro* in III. 6. 8 fails to appeal to me: there is nothing in the context to suggest it, no allusion to the catastrophe or the thunderbolt. What is in his head is the society of the city, and the *human* relation of Augustus to that society and its talk. *Ioui* here grates on my sense of the fitting. I should greatly prefer *deo*, as *e.g.* in IV. 4. 45 'Idque deus sentit,' *i.e.* Augustus. At the same time ('horresco referens') I do not feel absolutely certain that Ovid may not have after all written *uiro*, in spite of Professor Housman's remarks about *colere* ('when a subject "colit Caesarem" he "colit deum" and not "uirum"'). The reader of the *Tristia* would have no doubt as to the person meant; and the context suggests the human rather than the divine Augustus. The two are often strangely mixed up, as in *Tristia* II. 53 ff. and *Ex Ponto* III. 8. 15-24¹; but in this passage I do not find the deity.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham, Oxon.

¹ Add *Tristia* V. 2. 45 ff., where 'Si fas est homini cum Ioue posse loqui' is closely followed by 'Ouir non ipso quem regis orbe minor.'

NOTES

ΑΣΤΗΡ ΣΕΙΠΙΟΣ IN EUR. *I.A.* 7-8.

MR. HOUSMAN has misapprehended my meaning (*C.R.* 28. 8). Sirius is invisible, for it is below the horizon. Capella is out of the question, for it is out of range: Agamemnon is not gazing in

that direction. The star is well up from the horizon, somewhere within a large circle, with mid-heaven as a centre. Under the circumstances the meridian would be the most unlikely position of all: 'verba ἔτι μεσσήρης non ita premenda' (Hermann). That

the star was a planet occurred to me also (I quote Theon in my article, and his comment on this passage in my *Greek Tragic Poets*); but I preferred Aldebaran, because this star *was known to be* ἐγγὺς Πλειάδος. It is hardly conceivable that a Greek general would have been less familiar with Mars, Venus, Saturn, or Jupiter, than was his servants; nor would he need to be told that the star in question was 'near the Pleiades.'

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

GREEK ELEGIACS.

THE BREAK AFTER A TROCHEE IN THE FOURTH FOOT OF THE HEXAMETER.

A PRIZE version in the *Saturday Westminster Gazette* of December 24 (26), 1914, was accorded especial praise, and received the honour of being reprinted in the Educational Supplement of *The Times* of January 5, 1915. One of the hexameters in it ended παρὰ σοῖσι πόδεσσι βάλοιμι, and this, as well as a line ending πάροιθεν ἐγεύσας κρήνης in an introductory poem to the *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway* (Cambridge, 1913), make it possible to doubt whether English scholars realise the *extreme* rarity of such a break—so common and elegant in Latin, *modulatur amabile carmen*—in the Greek hexameter, particularly in Elegiacs. The Greek Anthology contains well over 16,000 hexameters, and a rough count seems to show only the following instances of this break: *Anth. Pal.* i. 31 (Marinus?), 102 (Menander Proctor); vii. 57, 96, 104, 126 twice (all Diogenes Laertius); ix. 452,¹ 595,² 655² (all incert.); xi. 130 (Pollianus), 173 (Philippus), 425 (incert.); xv. 32, 34² (all Arethas Diaconus), 37, 40 thrice (all

Cometas); *Anth. Plan.* iii. 21; iv. 174, 302; *Append. Epigr.* 119, 170, 185, 192, 217, 247, 261 (all incert.).³ These twenty-nine instances occur largely in writers of the Christian age, and probably none is found in a poem of any real poetic feeling: there are, however, perhaps four instances in Theognis and one in Tyrtaeus. In poems written entirely in hexameters the break is possibly not quite so rare as in elegiacs (eight of the examples from the *Anthology* are in such poems); even so, its occurrence is most infrequent. It seems therefore that its employment in versions which profess to be constructed on classical models might be considered as an actual mistake: the rule is really not stated with sufficient force and clarity in the standard works on metre, such as those of Christ, Havet, and Gleditsch.

S. GASELEE.

Magdalene College, Cambridge.

NOTES ON VESPA.

P.L.M. iv., p. 379 (Baehrens), v. 1.

ter ternae uarias cuncteque traditis artes.

So T: S has *cunctaque: uarias cunctis* Riese: *uarie cunctas* Baehrens.

v. 32 has *cunctas qui tradidit artes*, but that seems insufficient ground for abandoning the form of the MSS.: perhaps

uarias sanctae quae.

v. 11.

numina per Cereris iuro, per Apollinis arcus!

Vespa was too good a rhetorician to have missed the antithesis. We should read:

lumina per Cereris.

v. 30.

prouocor ut dicam: militem tu roso temptas quem docuit notus Cerealis fingere panes
urbe Placentinus, cunctas qui tradidit artes
Pythagoras populo nescis quam suaserit olim?

A *locus desperatus*. I give the passage as in Baehrens' text: the conjectures are innumerable. In v. 30 I would suggest:

molitorem tirone temptas,

¹ This instance should probably be omitted. It occurs in the second of a series of fifty-two short pieces of hexameters (mostly) on mythological subjects, obviously all by the same author. He frequently omits the augment, and μετέπειτα δ' ἐνόσφισε can equally well be read μετέπειτα δὲ νόσφισε, and this division of words is actually adopted by Stadtmueller.

² Lines with extremely licentious and irregular caesuras.

³ It is unlikely that this list is complete; but the very few more examples that might be found by a closer inspection would not affect the contention as to the very great rarity of this break.

putting an interrogation mark after *Placentinus*. Wernsdorf had already seen that *cunctas qui tradidit artes* belonged to Pythagoras (? is *cunctas* again an error for *sanctas*). *molitor* occurs only in the Digest so far as I have found, but it may well have been used here.

As to v. 31 all the commentators seem to make *Cerealis* the name of the baker's teacher. As no other proper name occurs of such a kind, may it not be simply *cereales*? Translate, then:

'Do you, a mere novice (alluding to the priority of bread to meats), challenge

a miller, who was taught by the inventor of Placentine cakes, whom his city makes famous?'

v. 82.

exseco sic gallos quasi (quas T.) Berecynthia Gallos

surely *qualis*. Teuffel defends *quasi*, which Baehrens also keeps as a mark of erudition, but Verg. *Aen.* vi. 784, was impossible to miss.

R. T. C.

Perth, N.B.

REVIEWS

THE PRIMITIVE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS.

The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts. By ALBERT C. CLARK. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 4s.

PROFESSOR CLARK'S incursion into the most complex of all fields of textual criticism might be expected to bring advantages such as have often accrued to Biblical science by the wholesome neglect of the rule that keeps the shoemaker to his last. An expert trained for this new work by long familiarity with the ways of Ciceronian copyists, he can obviously enlighten us as to the weakness of scribes whose fellows may have dealt in like manner with the Gospels. He tells us that the careless omission of whole lines, one or many at a time, is the badge of all their tribe; and he is led accordingly to hold that the canon *breuior lectio potior* is to be reversed, and the fullest text is in general to be taken as primitive. In this of course Professor Clark has had predecessors. Mr. Cronin applied the principle to the omissions of the Sinaiticus in the Fourth Gospel (*Journ. Theol. Stud.* xiii. 563 ff., 1912); and Dr. Rendel Harris included it among the various processes discussed in an elaborate paper in *Amer. Journ. Philol.* iii. (1882) appendix. But its uses in this book go far beyond anything previously attempted. Thus it is held to support the existence of Mk 16⁹⁻²⁰ and Jn 7⁵³—8¹¹ in 'an archetype of the Gospels

in book-form, which cannot be later than the middle of the second century.' Lest some Rip van Winkle should too hastily arise at the sound of such doctrine, and offer this little volume on Dean Burgon's tomb, as a tardy fulfilment of his famous prediction, we must be careful to observe Professor Clark's limitations. He is not concerned with 'the ultimate problems of New Testament autographs,' and starts with the text current in the second century. The Synoptic Problem and Higher Criticism generally he promises to avoid, and he keeps his promise. The careful reader of this book must therefore begin by asking whether in a very complex and many-sided problem a single method can be expected to secure really trustworthy results. And if Professor Clark's thesis were conceded, must we necessarily assume that the reconstructed text of A.D. 150 represents better than its rivals the autographs published between fifty and a hundred years earlier? The classical scholar, thankful when his archetypes are not more than ten times as distant in date from their originals, may too readily assume that a text of this date is necessarily better than one of A.D. 250. But it at least needs to be proved; and the full acceptance of Professor Clark's canon would leave this proof as far away as ever.

I shall of course attempt no discus-

sion of the palaeographical case involved: a mere philologist has no business in that galley. I am able now¹ to refer to Sir F. G. Kenyon's criticism in the *Church Quarterly* for October, 1914 (pp. 68-72), which relieves a non-expert from any uneasiness he might feel lest some obvious questions that occur to him may be impertinences. I am glad to find that I really was right in asking whether absolutely any omission of some length might not be proved to be an exact number of lines or pages, when the elasticity of the unit is taken into account. 'With this latitude of variation, the proof of omissions becomes as easy as a Baco-Shakespearian cryptogram.' With this and other palaeographical objections Sir F. G. Kenyon riddles the new theory from stem to stern. Leaving this side of the case alone, I want to urge the claims of other interested parties whom Professor Clark keeps out of court. A proposal to canonise Codex Bezae compels us to hear the devil's advocate, and he cannot be forbidden to range beyond the narrow limits allowed by this book. Not that I am a candidate for that post. In bidding us bow down and worship in the Cambridge Library instead of the Vatican, Professor Clark is only bettering an instruction which all our newer textual critics have been giving us in a less extreme form. Hort usually treated D as an irredeemably bad egg. Professor Clark labels it 'fresh,' though not quite 'new-laid.' My own opinion is that parts of it are excellent, but nature rebels against swallowing it whole.

It will be noticed that in this matter the new doctrine involves a curious inversion of Hort's. For the great Cambridge master D was not worth a walk down King's Parade unless it left out something which the other MSS. contained. Oxford now comes to assure us that the Cantabrigiensis must be followed, except when it yields to the universal failing and perpetrates an omission. We are, it seems, to class

the β -text² omission of Mk 16⁹⁻²⁰, and the δ -text omissions in Luke's Passion narrative, as accidental, and reflecting an archetype in which the omission covered an exact number of lines. It will probably occur to most readers that it is strange to explain the omission of the last paragraph of a book by a theory depending on calculation of so many lines omitted. Are we intended to assume that the scribe wrote as far as *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*, went off to dinner, and on his return forgot where he was and turned over a page? It seems much simpler to assume, as is usually done, that the archetype of all our MSS. and versions was a roll which had lost its conclusion, frayed off, as so often happens at the end.

The book consists almost entirely of elaborate enumerations as to the omissions found in several of the great MSS., and the Greek copy which underlies the Lewis Syriac version. These omissions are classified according to the number of letters left out, and exercises in G.C.M. tell us the length of line in the original. Thus Σ , itself written with 13 or 14 letters a line, 'is derived from an ancestor with an average of 10-12 letters'; another ancestor is suspected with a longer line. The other Sinai document is similarly analysed. Professor Clark counts 485 places in its underlying Greek where 10 letters and over are omitted. Of these 196 involve 10-12 letters, 32 drop 20-22, and six 31. It may be easily admitted that in these cases, or a large number of them, the accidental omission of one, two, or three lines in the Greek text might supply a *vera causa* for a translator's aberration. The phenomena of Ciceronian MSS., Professor Clark's starting-point, assure us that the best literary scribes were prone to err this way.

The table for the Lewis Syriac suggests, however, that we must lay more emphasis than readers generally will upon Professor Clark's own caveats that 'much must have been due to accident,' and that certain classes of omissions 'go back to an earlier stage

¹ I should explain that this review was written six months ago, and lost in the post, so that I have had to rewrite it after much time has been lost.

² I use Kenyon's notation, and wish Professor Clark had done the same.

in the development.' There are 124 instances where 13-16 letters are involved, 48 of 17-19, 35 of 23-28, and 10 of 33-37; and we have a collection of longer omissions ranging over a great variety of totals—41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 65, 70, 83, 128, 132, 167, and 262 letters. Stress is laid on these last, since 'mere accident, apart from line-division, becomes less likely' as the omissions become longer. 'Most of the omissions were made in a previous copy': the immediate model was probably one with 14-16 letters per line, accounting for 78 of these omissions, but most of the omissions are assigned on internal evidence to the smaller unit. When we have two divisors like 10-12 and 14-16 to operate with, we feel that the bed of Procrustes is very accommodating. Let us call these respectively *a* and *b*, and allow each symbol the three values given. The first six of the 'longer omissions' for which numbers are given above become thus 4*a* (i.e., $3 \times 10 + 11$), 3*b* ($2 \times 14 + 15$), 3*b* ($14 + 2 \times 15$), and similarly 3*b*, 3*b*, 3*b*—all three of which may also be 4*a*, as their two predecessors may be. In the whole series the only members which will not fit both divisors are 41 (4*a*), 49 (neither), 50, 51 and 54 (5*a*), 65 (6*a*), and 83 (8*a*). Above 49, if my arithmetic is not astray, every possible number of letters can be expressed in complete lines of 10, 11, or 12 letters; above 97, every number can similarly be expressed in 14, 15, or 16 letters. There are, moreover, only 11 possible omissions of over nine letters which could not be expressed as *xa*, only 36 of over 13 letters which could not be *xb*. Even small omissions therefore, given two such elastic units, have an excellent chance of being adaptable to one line or the other, especially when we are at liberty to retain or drop movable -*v*, to spell *ai* or *ei* or *i* at will, or write letters small at the end of a line as *¶* does constantly. Since then Professor Clark's explanation will account for absolutely any omission of ten letters and over, are we not cherishing a natural instinct when we feel shy of a pill that will cure everything?

For when we proceed to look into

these omissions we find that the Lewis shares a good many of them with authorities of different classes. In Tischendorf's apparatus we find company for it in Mk 9³ *Xan*, Lk 6⁴⁰ ΓΛ* 48^{ev}, Lk 20¹⁹ Marcion (who also omitted τὸν λαὸν before), Jn 5¹² ΓΛ* α⁶ *b*, Lk 12⁹ *e* syr^{cod}, Lk 14²⁷ M* RΓal *mu*, Mt 5⁴⁷ *k* (and Tatian, says von Soden), Mt 5³⁰ *D*. Are these independent errors arising from similar causes, or must we find some common ancestry? The difficulty here is, however, nothing to that in which Professor Clark's passion for inclusiveness lands him in two notable passages, where he is certainly the first to recognise veritable Holy Writ. In Mt 27⁴⁹ *¶ B* add what Hort called a very early interpolation, taken from Jn 19³⁴ almost verbatim. It makes absolute havoc of the sense, but Professor Clark 'would merely point out that the passage may well represent six lines of the archetype' (p. 56). And when we come to the last page of Mark, the ingenious theory is offered that the 'Shorter Conclusion,' which stands first in the two or three MSS. that contain it, is original, and the 'Longer Conclusion' follows it up and expands it. I notice, however, that the new interpolation found in W is a little too much for even such faith to digest. And yet it could indisputably have been written so as to occupy an exact number of complete lines: the formulae 46*a* and 33*b* (as above) will represent it equally well.

I venture to think that the most significant lesson of Professor Clark's failure is the impossibility of helping forward the solution of very complex problems by employing one method and closing our eyes to the rest. We are tempted to such behaviour by the instinct which forbids every scholar to tread in unfamiliar fields; and we cannot but sympathise with this great specialist in Cicero when he refuses to discuss synoptic problems, or other sides of New Testament textual criticism which lie outside the method he has chosen to set forth. But since his method will apply to absolutely any omission except the shortest, we cannot possibly exclude the consideration of alternative accounts. In Mt 5³⁰ it is no doubt easy to say that the omission was in a common ancestor

of D and the Lewis, where 13 lines of the shorter unit, or 9 of the longer, were dropped by homoeoteleuton. But this Logion comes to us from both of our main Synoptic sources; and the addition of a saying about the right hand can be easily assigned to Mk 9⁴⁸, which was taken over in a shortened form in the doublet at Mt 18⁸. The omission is therefore right, as those of D so often are, even in places where Westcott and Hort did not apply their principle.

It will be well at this point to hear the conclusion of the whole matter, as expressed in the last paragraph of the book. 'The oldest text is that quoted by the earliest Fathers and rendered in the most ancient versions.' As against the β -text (Hort's 'Neutral'), which 'can claim no earlier testimony on its behalf than the partial support of Origen,' the δ -family ('Western') 'presents the text which was used by the predecessors of Origen, and can boast of a series of witnesses going back to the generation which succeeded the Apostles. In Z [the δ -text], therefore, I recognise the primitive text.' Quotations follow from P. Corssen and Professor Burkitt, which however are not as congruous as Professor Clark seems to regard them. The former, in 1892, set down the β -text as 'merely the reflection of a recension capriciously formed in the fourth century, which, like every modern version, must have been subjective in character.' This sounds well, but one would like to know how we are to avoid subjectivity. If 'Z' is to be accepted solidly (except in its omissions!), we must know how to find Z, and it is largely an unknown quantity. Professor Burkitt's words are more helpful. 'Let us come out of the land of Egypt, and let us see whether the agreement of East and West, of Edessa and Carthage, will not give us a surer basis on which to establish our text of the Gospels.' We must put that earlier dictum with teaching which Professor Burkitt has given us more recently, proving that the Old Syriac is really 'Western' in readings it shared with the Old Latin and got from Tatian, but genuinely Antiochene of a very early date in places where it differs from Tatian. The isolation of this very early Antioch text gives us three primi-

tive types, Antiochene, Western and Egyptian; and the agreement of two of these gives us the most hopeful method of escaping subjectivity. But to edit with completeness and certainty either the Antiochene or the Western text is unhappily beyond our present resources, even if we allow that Westcott and Hort gave us approximately what is now generally regarded as a third (not 'fourth'!) century Egyptian revision.

Let us assume, however, that we are to ignore the β -text, and take the early Egyptian record from the Sahidic and Clement. In the Gospels we have the Old Syriac to help us, but we shall have some difficulty in catching the voice of Edessa when we come to the Acts. This suggests a question to which Professor Clark gives us no answer. What are we to do when the δ -text is not shorter or longer than the β -text, but simply different? In the Acts we have a large number of additions in D, which I gather Professor Clark would accept almost *en bloc*, since they could all of them be expressed in $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\iota$. Here I should very often be tempted to agree, as for instance in regard to the statement (Acts 19⁹) that Paul used the lecture-room during the heat of the day, while Tyrannus was enjoying his siesta: whether internal evidence is always, or even generally, as convincing, I should gravely doubt. But when D or its fellows make a statement differing largely in words but not in fact, are we bound to accept its form, just because the text as a whole has earlier attestation? Has Professor Clark really faced the difficulty of preferring δ to β (or even α !) in a very large number of places? The harmonising tendencies of δ are alone sufficient to forbid the short and easy method of accepting δ (when known), with supplements from β when δ yields to the scribes' besetting sin of omission. The influence of Harmonies was bound to cause much assimilation of parallel records; and it seems a perfectly sound canon that we should generally prefer a reading which involves a difference, to one which may be due merely to assimilation. And can we really doubt that many variations in D and the Old Latin are due to mere paraphrase, and have no intrinsic

claim to be preferred to the familiar alternative? Professor Clark boldly argues (p. 81) that in Acts 'the Greek MSS. in general were drawn from a single ancestor written in *στίχοι*, such as those found in D, and had in a number of cases omitted lines of their original.' Before we can possibly accept this, we must study the text of D, which is assumed to be free from the infection of this imperfect archetype, and apply to it a variety of tests the consideration of which Professor Clark excludes. Is there really any probability that this all-round examination will be other than eclectic in its results?

I venture to close this notice with a word of personal opinion, though with the diffidence appropriate in one whose study of New Testament textual criticism is not that of a specialist. I have, however, qualified perhaps for one contribution by a protracted study of orthography as established for vernacular Greek of the first century by our various new evidence. I have been much struck by the number of cases in which the old uncials preserve spellings which can be proved current in the time of the autographs, but obsolete long before the fourth century. Faithful in minutiae, they might reasonably be expected to be faithful also in greater matters. Anyhow, orthography seems to demonstrate the dependence of $\aleph$ and B as well as D upon exemplars of at least the second century: that all three include later elements is of course not excluded. Is it not possible to explain 'the hypothesis that gross license began to reign in sub-Apostolic times, but that the "neutral" text was preserved in some unknown place' (p. 111), which Professor Clark thinks 'most violent and in itself very unlikely,' by reference to the conditions under which the Christians' sacred books must have been handed down through ages of persecution? Cicero was copied in scriptoria: having secured the orator's head, the proscription apparently did not try to suppress even the Philippics. But how often was the scriptorium used for the Gospels? Little books, like Hort's archetype of C in the Apocalypse, copied often by 'prentice hands, with many abbreviations and a generally non-

literary form, must have made up largely the ancestry of the sumptuous codices written in the days of peace. Nor were the scribes mechanical copyists. They lived when oral tradition was abundant and highly valued, and when no canonical sanctity protected the written text. If an itinerant preacher repeated a Logion he had heard long ago from an apostolic man, it was sure to be copied into some more or less appropriate place in a Gospel, and transferred from margin to text at the next copying. The copyists, moreover, had the substance of their text by heart. They needed it constantly when no copy was available, and it was usually not safe to carry their books about. It was easy therefore to relapse into paraphrase. The confusion of the Old Latin text, as witnessed by Jerome, and by the infinite variety of our extant MSS., presents conditions suggestively similar; and we might perhaps even say the same of the Old Syriac, if the differences between our two witnesses may be to some extent credited to such a cause. The text therefore was peculiarly liable to interpolation, if by this we only mean the insertion of matter not due to the original author. We may both endorse the omission of these by β or δ text, and hold the conviction that they often preserved an authentic tradition. Will not such considerations dispose of Professor Clark's contention that it is easier to omit than to invent?

I suggest therefore that we are free to give the δ -text very much greater weight than Hort conceded, and frankly to make the β -text a revision, but to prefer the latter still in most places where omissions are not concerned. We assume that Alexandrian scholars in the third century—possibly under Origen's inspiration—felt themselves driven by the existing chaos to attempt for the Greek very much what Jerome was later attempting for the Latin. They must have used some MSS. which stood very near the autographs, and were largely free from the license which almost everybody feels compelled to credit to the 'Western' developments. This leaves us full liberty to believe that the revisers often wrongly rejected δ readings. Till the experts succeed in

tracing some new principle which will objectively sift them, we must still continue to write on the margin of our Westcott and Hort those δ variants which take our individual fancy.

As to the plea that the β -text has no patristic backing, I would suggest that if these postulated early MSS. were prior to the processes that produced the new elements in the δ -text, their survival in a centre of learning might even be unknown till scholars unearthed them. Even a single copy, recognised as very old and good by the instinct of a scholar like Origen, might easily have been responsible for most of the material brought in by the revisers, who gave it a precedence very much like that of B in Hort's regard. The revision need never have become popular, or even known outside Alexandria or Egypt. The time of its production was not favourable, and the δ -text was at least as hard to dislodge as the Genevan Version was when challenged by the Authorised. And meanwhile the α -text was on its way, evolved when the Church had left outward danger behind, and was free to devote herself to doctrinal discussions that made an authoritative recension necessary. This was achieved under the inspiration of the instinct which Professor Clark so heartily approves. A net which gathered of every kind, it took in δ elements and β , as well as its own mostly stylistic novelties; and this inclusiveness no doubt commended it. In a comparatively short time it had

driven its older rivals from the field, not to yield its place to them until the nineteenth century was nearly over.

What has been said must suffice for the indications of my scepticism as to Professor Clark's case for D against B as our primary authority. I feel that his doctrine of omissions deserves careful consideration as a factor in very many places, though tests which he excludes from his survey prevent us from allowing it weight in very many more. I am abundantly ready to be convinced of the claim of D and its company to a hearing in multitudes of places where it was shut out by the great critics of Hort's school, and in no small proportion of them we should give their reading preference. But I do not see how we can give them blind allegiance; and I must confess that Professor Clark has not persuaded me to relax the 'smile' of incredulity with which we hear that such incongruous passages as the end of our Mark, or the Pericope Adulterae, are to be taken as composed for the places they now occupy, even if they did hold that place as early as 150 A.D. But it need not be said that if Professor Clark does not carry our assent, a laborious and skilful argument like his must advance our knowledge by sending us back afresh to our first principles, to reinforce them with newly gathered argument, if not as he desires to abandon them for doctrines new and somewhat strange.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury College, Manchester.

THREE CHICAGO MONOGRAPHS.

The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers.

By ALONSO ROSECRANS STARK.
10" x 7". Pp. xii + 60. Chicago: The University Press, 1912. (No price given.)

Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers. By HENRY B. ROBISON.
10" x 7". Pp. 45. Chicago: The University Press, 1913. 2s.

A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis. By JOHN S. MCINTOSH.
10" x 7". Pp. x + 130. Chicago: The University Press, 1912. 3s.

THE Chicago University Press—represented in this country by the Cambridge University Press—is doing a good service in publishing a number of scholarly monographs at a low price on technical literary subjects, for which in the nature of things there cannot be a large demand.

In the first of the three before us Dr. Stark discusses the Christology of the Apostolic Fathers, and finds that for this purpose they fall into three groups: (i.) 1 Clement and the Didache, which emphasise the subordination of

Christ to the Father; (ii.) Ignatius, Polycarp and 2 Clement, where Christ is designated God, and becomes equal to the Father in respect of soteriological work; (iii.) Barnabas, Hermas and the Epistle to Diognetus, in which cosmological functions are ascribed to Christ. The relevant passages are carefully collected and to some extent discussed. In places a fuller discussion seems to be needed—for instance, the meaning of the phrase *παῖς θεοῦ*. References are generally given with liberality—the last paragraph on p. 24 is an exception—but several serious misprints have crept in among them. For instance, on p. 7 read Ps. xxxiv. 11-17 for Ps. liii. 1-11, and xvi. 15 for xv. 16. The reference to Philo on p. 4 is given in a manner hardly worthy of a learned thesis—namely, an English rendering taken from a book of Archbishop Trench.

Dr. Robison confines himself to one point of grammar. The 3,100 cases in which the participle occurs in the Apostolic Fathers are tabulated and arranged with great minuteness. For example, to give one calculation, there are 1,252 instances of participles where the logical force is adverbial. These are divided into Time 271, Condition 43, Concession 31, Cause 102, Purpose and Result 13, Means 41, Manner 189, Attendant Circumstances 562, the references being given in every case. The author's claim in the preface that the study has a value 'in the light which is thrown upon the usages of the New Testament books, and in the aid that is given for their interpretation' is hardly justified, since in a final comparison of the Apostolic Fathers with New Testament Greek no instance is given where any light is thrown on the exegesis of the New Testament. Dr. Robison concludes 'that the Apostolic Fathers are freer from Hebraistic influences than the New Testament' in their use of the participle, but omits to say to what narrow limits Hebraistic influences on

New Testament Greek are reduced by most present-day scholars. However, grammatical studies in any given field no doubt deserve to be prosecuted for their own sake, and the present thesis is a most careful and laborious contribution to the science of language.

One caution should perhaps be expressed in regard to both these books. 'Apostolic Fathers' is a convenient label for a number of early Christian documents not included in the Canon, which happen to survive. Chronologically, the earliest of them is probably prior to parts of the New Testament. In no sense do they form a literary unity. Such investigations as the above must therefore be considered in the light of a series of studies on separate books, and all generalisations avoided as likely to prove misleading.

The third thesis is a contribution to the study of the Old Latin Bible. The writer's purpose is first to reconstruct the text of Genesis used by Augustine, then to compare it with other Old Latin fragments, the Vulgate and the LXX, and finally to investigate the Latinity of the reconstructed text. He is handicapped in his task by the uncritical nature of some of the texts at his disposal, even the Vienna *Corpus* being far from satisfactory in its treatment of Biblical quotations. The most interesting part of the book is the treatment of the linguistic problem. Are the peculiarities of the Old Latin due to the intrusion of colloquial elements, so that the version becomes an authority for the popular speech of the period? The answer is in the negative. Dr. McIntosh concludes that they are the effect of Graecisms, and Hebraisms emerging through the LXX; the influence of popular Latin is secondary, nor is it possible to deduce from the language the original home of the Latin version.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

THE METAMORPHOSIS OF OVID.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV., Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur Narrationes Fabularum Ovidianarum. Recensuit apparatu critico instruxit HUGO MAGNUS. Accedunt Index Nominum et tres Tabulae Photographicae. Berolini apud Weidmannos, MDCCCXCIV. 1 vol. 9"×6". Pp. xxxiv+766. 30s. net.

THIS is a book that has been long expected, and will be eagerly scanned by students of Ovid. Ellis used to say that it would take a lifetime to produce an adequate edition of the *Metamorphoses*, and it is almost thirty years since the present editor began to 'peg out his claim.' The final output is now before us, and as regards the labour and devotion that have been lavished on the work there can be no two opinions. Dr. Magnus has long been honourably known for his series of preliminary studies, enumerated on p. xxx, and his *editio minor* of the poem for schools. In his *magnum opus* he now gives us first, in smooth and lucid Latin, an 'ideal' biography of the text, a brief description of the chief codices employed, a *résumé* of the work which his predecessors have done, and hints for those who may come after him (see especially pp. xxv and xxvi). In the collection of *testimonia* and the collation of MSS., both, but especially the former, planned on a generous scale, he has received and acknowledges much assistance from his friends. Photographic facsimiles are added to show, as only facsimiles can, the MS. position in regard to the typical crux at I. 545 ff. Another excellent feature is the republication, with an *app. crit.*, of the prose arguments attributed to Lactantius Placidus (see p. 627) from MSS. which contain them. For the *app. crit.* of the poem M has himself collated—for the first time, apparently, and in full—Marcianus 223 (saec. xi.-xii.)=F, while the readings of the rather numerous and important fragments are religiously compiled from various sources and presented under a new nomenclature which is pretty sure, I should say, to

be generally adopted, and will no doubt be a convenience later. Among these fragments appears for the first time the *Fragmentum Hauniense* (κ), containing the greater part of Books IX.-X., which also M has collated himself and of which more anon.

M's view of the MS. problem is *prima facie* sane and safe. It may not be agreed unanimously that the MSS. fall into two families, and two only—O and X; but all will allow that the readings of O, when available, must be considered first. Unfortunately the chief representatives of this family, viz., M and N, which descend, as their lacunae prove, from one original through copies Y and Z, are not only *mutili* but themselves occasionally interpolated. Hence the generally admitted importance of the *deteriores* and the complexity of the editor's task.

M was singled out by Heinsius as supreme, but it was treated by him only as *primus inter pares*. It is therefore not a little disappointing to find that more of his *vetustiores* have not been traced and collated for this edition. Perhaps some day an enthusiast (or a committee of enthusiasts) may institute such a search in the libraries of Europe as Heinsius made in his time for MSS. of this poem, and as Professor Gardner Hale has made in ours for MSS. of Catullus.

It must be said at once that this edition has the defects of its qualities. It is a record for the specialist and the man of leisure, not a guide for the general reader or the busy student.

In planning out his work, as regards the MS. problem, the editor had to choose between two alternatives. (1) Preaching as he does the pre-eminence of O, he might well have based his text on the O family alone, giving its evidence in full detail and summarising *as briefly as possible* the contribution of the X family (*i.e.* the rest of the exceedingly numerous MSS. of the poem.) This is what Riese did and did well. It is also the line for which M's preliminary studies had qualified him and prepared his public; or (2) he

might, like Heinsius, have surveyed the whole field. Heinsius edited the text 'ἐκλεκτικῶς,' it is true, but from collations of some sixty-five MSS. or more.¹ Recognising fully the value of **M** and **N**, both of which he collated throughout, Heinsius yet gave the other authorities their due, and was therefore able repeatedly to correct from them the many slips of the **O** family. Had he only published his collations in full, there would be nothing left for any modern editor to do. As it is, **M** draws freely (but with little or no acknowledgment) on the Heinsius excerpts contained in Burmann. Hence the numerous codices of which we read the names in the *app. crit.* but have no account given in the Introduction. When **M** has had the credit for his recollations of **M** and **N**, **h** and (?) **l**, it must be admitted that his *app. crit.*, with the important exceptions of **κ** and **F**, is mainly a compilation and therefore, in view of the high pretensions which it makes, a disappointment. Failing to show the courage of his convictions by adopting the first alternative, he has overloaded the *app. crit.* to a deplorable extent by gathering into it at haphazard not only the Heinsius excerpts mentioned, but whatever published or unpublished collations of inferior MSS. he could find—**g** (Pet-schenig), **p** (Bothe), 'c Sprotii' ('raro ab Heinsio laudatus et inferioris ut uidetur notae,' says Loers), and **s**, which he most unfairly calls a pillar of Heinsius' text. Having done this he professes to have given in full all the evidence that has come down to us.

This question of plan is fundamental: and if the principle **M** has chosen be unsound, it must determine our judgment of the whole. But before passing on to consider in detail the collations of some of the MSS. cited, with which I am more or less intimately acquainted, it should be observed that as a record the book will in any case have a value of its own for the specialist, as showing which of the conjectures—printed very many of them no doubt, 'ne iterum proferantur'—and which of the MSS.

—**g**, **p**, **s**, to wit—may be safely left behind for the future.

M's reports of the readings of the chief British Museum MS., Add. 11967 (saec. x.-xi.), = **β**, are sometimes defective and sometimes incorrect. There is a *suppressio ueri* at vi. 77 (the *not. crit.* should run *fretū β¹, equū s.l. β²*) and a *suggestio falsi* at VI. 200, where whatever the reading of **β¹** may have been, it was not 'Ites aiΔes' ('possibly "auies"; anyhow not a Δ,' says Mr. Gilson, the Keeper of the MSS.). At V. 343 *sumā st* (*sic*) is clearly not 'sumus deletum,' etc., as **M** contends, but 'sumum' (a dittography of *sum*; cf. ad IX. 387), corrected later to 'sunt.' The scribe makes an exactly similar mistake ('miserere' for 'miserē') at 626 *infra*. 'Pauent' at VI. 58 is by no means *paene eras*. At V. 657 (and elsewhere) **β** has 'quod,' not 'qui': it is **M** (not the scribe) quem 'compendiorum similitudo fefellit'! At V. 285 it has *desi(d partim eras)erant*.² The Marcianus has 'desi|erant. Fuitne 'deciderant imbres'? Cf. *Fast.* II 494. Photographs of the MS. show no trace of a virgula either over 'cornu' at II. 874 or over 'unda' at III. 200. At III. 218 'niue is' (*sic*) was worth noting in view of the variant 'niueus.' At p. 664, line 1, I would suggest 'suspensus a caute' (for the corrupt 'acute'), though in Apollodorus it is from a pine that Marsyas is suspended. Lastly, in a suspected line a clue like 'Indo tata' (*sic β*) at IV. 757 is surely worth recording and following. A British Museum MS. (Kings 26, saec. xi.-xii.) has here, from the first hand, 'Indorata,' and in the line before, 'Andromaden' (*sic*). Fortasse, 'Protinus, Andromeda, te tanti praemia facti, Indo nata, rapit.'³ **β** is (in Korn's phrase) 'paene gemellus Marciani,' and its evidence cannot therefore be scrutinised too carefully.

For another British Museum MS. of the first rank, Harleianus 2610 (= **ε** in

² See Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, Planche xcv.

³ Cf. Anth. Pal. V. 132 . . . καὶ Περσεὺς Ἰνδῆς ἡράσαρ' Ἀνδρομέδης; Ovid, *de Arte Am.* I. 53, III. 191, etc.; and for Andromedā, Lachm. Lucretius, p. 405. At *Met.* XIII. 523 the MSS. waver between 'dotabere' and 'donabere.'

¹ See the list enumerated in Loers, *Praefatio*.

this new nomenclature), M uses with acknowledgments Ellis's collation.¹ Speaking of the MS. from hearsay only, he yet impugns the date (late tenth century) assigned to it by Maunde Thompson. He is unaware that it contains in the margins, from a contemporary hand, the prose arguments by 'Lactantius' for Book I., fabb. 2-10 (with part of 1); and he expresses regret that the bulk of the MS. has perished ('partem multo maiorem eius periisse'), when, as a matter of fact, the scribe stopped short at III. 622, leaving the last page, fol. 37 verso, blank, so that we still possess every line he ever wrote.

Differing thus from Maunde Thompson about the age of ϵ , about the age of **N** our editor is at issue with another very eminent authority, Dr. Loew, who assigns the MS. to the twelfth century,² not (as M) to the eleventh. As for the ingenious theory which he bases (p. xiv) on the present state of **N**—'manus prima desinit fol. 188^v uersu xiv 838 . . . quod **M** desinit octo uersibus ante, uersu 830, id olim recte ita explicasse mihi uideor, ut dicerem *librum O uersu 838 desiisse* (the italics are mine). Huius codicis facta esse duo apographa,' etc.

Here M should certainly have mentioned that the last line in the original hand of **N** is also the last line of the verso of fol. 188, which is itself apparently the last leaf of a quire—a truly remarkable coincidence this, that **N** should reach the end of his exemplar and the end of his own vellum simultaneously! The facts are more naturally explained on the hypothesis that part of the original script of **N** has perished, and that the loss was afterwards repaired by a later hand. But if **N** ever contained the whole or part of Book XV. in the original hand, its position becomes extremely interesting. For it has the prose arguments in the margin only (Riese, p. xxxi), not in the text; and two of the three signs of grace which, according to M, a MS. of the O

family must have, are the absence of Book XV. and the presence in the text (not the margin) of the 'Lactantius' arguments.

The evidence of κ should be carefully weighed, for it has affinities with the lost *Fragmentum Spirense*. M pronounces it to be 'saec. xii. exeuntis.' English expert opinion puts it a hundred years earlier. The Copenhagen authorities lent the MS. in December, 1913, to the Bodleian, where it was examined by Mr. Madan and adjudged by him to be late eleventh century. Sir George Warner and Mr. Gilson arrived independently at the same conclusion.

At IX. 415 it has 'addat' in the text and 'esse uictoris' (sic) *contra metrum*. Read, perhaps, 'addat neue necem sinat esse auctoris inultam.'³ The 'Lactantius' runs thus: 'petit a Ioue liberis suis, ut ultores patris essent, annos adiceret' (similarly Apollodorus III. 7. 6. 1 . . . ἵνα τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς τίσωνται φόνον). At X. 239 it has 'pro qua sui' (sic). Fortasse 'pro quaestu' (see the prose argument); but this involves altering 'st tamen' to 'set tamen' in the line before.⁴ At X. 647 'agro' ('auro,' κ) seems preferable to the Vulgate 'aruo.' The repetition (from 644) is Ovidian. And at X. 349 'acro' may perhaps favour 'acri' (ἱταμοῖς ὄφεισιν, Plan.).

For the prose arguments κ is often a help; and here M does less than justice to its readings, which he sometimes depreciates and sometimes misstates them. For instance, at p. 682, line 1, it has 'inibi,' not 'inibit.' Here **M** and **N** are badly interpolated; κ 's text seems sound, and should be adopted. At p. 682, line 9, it has 'eique' (sic), a slight but distinct improvement on the 'atque' of the others. At p. 686, line 7,

³ For this use of *auctor* cf. *Tristia*, IV. 4. 26 and 34; *Met.* VI. 172.

⁴ Two other misstatements in M's note on this line need correction. **N** has *qua* (not *quo*), and M's reading is quite uncertain. 'qu/ (a eras) **M**,' says M. Signor Rostagno examined the manuscript with me, and agreed that the letter erased is quite as likely to have been an æ diphthong as an a. M makes such play with his recollection of **M** and **N** that one might reasonably have expected him to quote their readings at any rate correctly throughout.

¹ *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Classical Series, i. 5 (1885). There is a facsimile in Chatelain, *op. cit.*, Planche 97. 1.

² *The Beneventan Script*, p. 354.

it has *ee* (i.e., AE AE = *ααλ*),¹ not 'esse' (!), as M states. Read, 'Post ob. eius cruor in florem inscriptum AI AI cessit.' Again, 'dulcitudine' (p. 685, line 7), 'usuário,' etc. (p. 683, line 10), 'errore' (p. 682, line 12), all look genuine; and 'concubuerint' (p. 689, line 5), as the rhythm shows, is right, the 'quam' in the line before being a corruption of 'quin.' At p. 686, line 1, 'phrygiae' is not, as M says, omitted by *κ*. The MS. gives 'adite' (i.e. a Dite), not 'adiit,' at p. 684, line 16, and 'ocubitū,' not 'seu bitū' (!), at p. 686, line 12. On the remainder I make three suggestions: At p. 683, line 10, read 'ne infida' ('iphis diu,' *κ* M) 'aduersus uirum cum infamia reperiretur' (cf. *ingratus aduersus deam*, p. 689, line 3).²

At p. 688, line 15, the evidence points to 'inpenso amore,' and at p. 684, line 18 f. to 'reuocatam ergo ad inferos Eurudicem' ('ut lucem,' *κ*; 'ut ad lucem,' M) 'cum conspiceret, sic dementia stupuisse dicitur,' etc. ('dicitur (?) *per compend.*' is my note of *κ*'s reading).

After recollating *h* (= Hauniensis 2008), it is strange that M should have failed to recognise in it the 'Hamburgensis prior' of Heinsius. Yet he cites the MS. sometimes (e.g. at XII. 494 and VI. 119) *twice over*, first as '*h*' and then as '*c* Hamb,' and sometimes (e.g. at VI. 374 and VII. 246), having missed a point which Heinsius observed, as '*c* Hamb' only. This is not workmanlike. Heinsius' 'Hamburgensis alter' is also at Copenhagen (= Hauniensis 2009, saec. xiii.), and M aggravates the confusion by citing this MS. too (e.g. at VII. 151 and XI. 243) as '*c* Hamb' only.³ The recollection of

h was worth making, but it is not flawless. There are oversights; e.g. at V. 239 for 'Proetus' *h* has 'solus' ('*om uoc h*' is M's comment)—a noteworthy reading, and supported by the *αὐτός* in Planudes, which M suppresses. *καὶ γὰρ οὗτος . . . τὴν Ἀκρ. πόλιν αὐτὸς ἐκτῆσατο*, says Planudes: M stops at *οὗτος*.

M has his inconsistencies. He condemns the Louvain MS. and accepts its evidence against the rest at V. 80. He finds *β* guilty of a tendency to write *s* for *r*, and adopts from it 'incesto' for 'incerto' at IV. 388. He pronounces Planudes almost worthless, and prints large excerpts from his version. He relegates to the *app. crit.* Professor Housman's brilliant correction of the solecism⁴ at VI. 489, and finds a place in the text for his own anæmic suggestion at XI. 180. While for the most part he is intensely conservative—so much so, that e.g. he keeps 'quid facit' at X. 637⁵—at other times he breaks loose, and e.g. ascribes to Ovid (at XV. 154) the error of a MS. dated 1362 A.D.

Many readers will turn first to Book XV. They will find much material⁶ but little satisfaction. The new witnesses of repute, *F* and *τ*, between them throw but little fresh light on the dark places in the text. From the latter M introduces at line 479 one novelty, which is also an improvement; but e.g. at 804 *F*'s original reading is erased, and at 838 it has the same corruption as the rest. At 838 M prints *Pyllos* (= Heinsius and Bentley), and at 804 *Aeneaden*, first introduced by Heinsius from a codex Vossianus (now in the British Museum), from which M makes yet another alteration at 570. The gloss in *a*₅ (saec. xiii.-xiv.) suggests, as Mr. Garrod

however (at the dictates of prudence), the number 8001 is dropped; but see Lemaire. Similarly at I. 69 *φ* is the Liège fragment. Delete from the note either *φ* or 'frg. Leodinense.'

⁴ See Madvig, *Aduersaria Critica*, ii, 83 (the reference is given in the *not. crit.*).

⁵ Merkel is cited as in favour of the reading; but Merkel (p. xxxii) begins by describing the construction thus: 'Manifestus, quantum puto, barbarismus et sine exemplo.'

⁶ There are excerpts and collations of *thirty-four* MSS., mostly 'notae inferioris.'

¹ So also in the text of the poem at X. 215. There again M overlooks the *cedillas*.

² The corresponding line of the poem (IX. 779) is corrupt. *Punior* is not Ovidian, and Plan. seems here, as elsewhere, to be translating a gloss, *ὅτι . . . οὐκ ἀνείλον ταύτην ἐγώ*. The variants suggest something like—

Quod uidet haec lucem, quod non ego conscia plector.

³ Paris. 8001 was identified by Loers (praef. ad init.) with the Codex Berneggerianus Heinsii. Yet (e.g.) at I. 530 M gives us the note 'deo flamma est cc Bernegg. et Par. 8001'—*διοτὸν ἀνομάτουν μορφὴ μία*! So also at V. 343. There,

points out, that fuller citations of that manuscript's readings might with advantage have been given.

To sum up: I have used the book with increasing disappointment and distrust. A record—let alone an *editio critica*—should be faithful to the facts. Magnus has been overwhelmed by the mere mass of his material—'mole ruit sua.' Enough has been said to show that the book contains far too much slipshod and inaccurate work, together with a certain number of puerile errors. The unwieldy bulk of it and the outrageously large proportion of unimportant matter in the *app. crit.* are bound to tell heavily against it. As long as scholars can still buy for less than a pound the four volumes of Burmann's *Ovidii Opera Omnia*—a better text with better notes, and what is, after all, a better *apparatus criticus*—they will do well to hesitate before they lay out thirty shillings on an edition like this, of the *Metamorphoses* alone, which, in spite of the merits we have indicated, must, I fear, be regarded as

falling very far short of anything like adequate success. One cannot help wishing that Magnus had attempted less. With a narrower scope and greater vigilance he might have come much nearer than he does to that finality to which in the Praefatio he admits that he aspired.

A few obvious misprints and errata may be noted: P. xviii, line 14, for 55^v read 56^v. In the *app. crit.* at i. 90 dele h; at I. 268 for ϵ^2 and ϵ read ϵ^2 and e; at III. 421 for s read ϵ ; at III. 187 dele ϵ ; at IV. 393 for et halant read halant; at X. 408 and at XI. 610 for scripsi read Heinsius (cf. Burmann [1727] *ad loc.*); at IV. 298 in the *not. crit.* for 298/803 read 292/803. Lastly, Professor Housman ought not at this time of day to be credited with the conjectures ascribed to him at I. 632 and at VI. 63, both of which he withdrew—the former twice over and with emphasis—some fourteen years ago in this *Review* (C.R. xiv. 413 and xvi. 443 f.).

D. A. SLATER.

Bedford College, London, N.W.

SHORT NOTICES

Oxyrhynchus Papyri X. Edited with translations and notes by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. With six plates. London, 1914: Egypt Exploration Fund.

SOME verses of Sappho and Alcaeus, which are the chief treasures of this volume, have already been discussed by Mr. Edmonds in the last volume of this *Review*; but it is proper to give some account of its other contents. Among the theological pieces are some fragments of an uncanonical gospel, apparently a new one. Some of the sayings of Jesus are found in the canon, but in different context and with new elements: one seems to refer to the Greek proverbial saying that an enemy may become a friend, and should be treated accordingly. St. Matthew and St. John are also represented, also St. James's Epistle and Revelations. Three columns contain arguments of Menander's plays, the *Ílepeia* and the beginning

of the Imbrians: a vellum leaf contains new fragments of the *Ἐπιτρέποντες*, and there are other scraps of this author. Several columns of a Chrestomathy, give historical and mythological information. No. 1242 gives part of a new interview between Trajan and rival Greek and Jewish embassies from Alexandria.

A number of classical texts appear: Apollonius Rhodius (with accents), Herodotus (confirming the conjecture of *ὑπερθέμενος* for *ὑποθέμενος* in i. 108), Thucydides (inserting *ἐς* before *ἐπτά* in viii. 10. 3), Plato, Babrius, Achilles Tatius (with material differences of text), Cicero.

The official documents, as usual, contain many new points of interest, but they need technical knowledge to appraise them, and the information is so manifold that it is not easy to summarise. We may mention No. 1264, a Notification of Inviolability, *ἀσυνλία*, whether from duties or taxes or what

does not appear, nor is the reason clear: this is given as *ἐνταῖδα*, which the editors take as a mistake for *ἐνταῖδία*. No. 1266, the examination of a lad for membership of the gymnasium, is complete at the end, thus supplementing No. 257. A marriage contract No. 1273 dates from A.D. 260. No. 1275 is the engagement of musicians for a festival. Other contracts and accounts contain miscellaneous matter. The private letters include one from a mother protesting against the alienation of her son (No. 1295), one from a son assuring his sweetest father that he is really working very hard (No. 1296), and one from a son to his mother asking her to send him a number of things (No. 1300). Human nature does not change. S.

Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines
par L. LAURAND. Part I., II.,
pp. 260. Paris: Libraire Auguste
Picard. 1.50 fr. (sewed), or 2 fr.
(boards), each part.

THESE are the first two parts of a manual of information which should be very useful to the general reader as a guide to classical things. They are to be eight parts in all—(i.) Géographie, Histoire, Institutions grecques; (ii.) Littérature grecque; (iii.) Grammaire grecque; (iv.) Géographie, Histoire, Institutions romaines; (v.) Littérature latine; (vi.) Grammaire latine; (vii.) Métrique, Sciences complémentaires; (viii.) Tables méthodiques et alphabétiques—which may be subscribed for at 8 fr. (sewed), or 12 fr. (boards). The idea of the series is to give in easily accessible form all information necessary for the understanding and appreciation of classical antiquity. Each section has a bibliography with guidance for the more advanced study of the subject. The two parts already issued embody the results of quite recent work. The history outline is very good; it is divided into sections, to each of which is affixed a list of contemporary and of later sources. The part on Greek institutions is full of interesting facts, varying from the fashion of wearing the beard at Sparta, details of Greek daily life and education, types of agriculture, etc., down to

descriptions of the Olympic games, oracles, and the Eleusinian mysteries. In fact, the subjects touched upon within these sixty pages present a most varied and animated picture of Greek civilisation. The *literature* volume gives a full analysis of the subject matter of the chief works, followed by literary criticism and appreciation which is often based upon the remarks of Quintilian and other ancient critics. The bibliography of this part is especially useful, and should be invaluable to students working by themselves. Valuable hints abound everywhere. How many of our tutors give their pupils such good advice as this on Dionysius of Halicarnassus? "Aussi ne peut-on se dispenser de le lire si l'on veut étudier à fond les formes de la prose grecque et latine."

R. B. APPLETON.

Euripides and his Age. By GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 256. Home University Library: Williams and Norgate. 1s. net.

THIS little book is meant for English readers, and we can imagine nothing better calculated to fill them with a desire to learn Greek, if only that they may be able to read the plays of this one author in the original. It is a notable addition to the series and, as might be expected, has interest for the scholar as well as for the general reader. There is a brief, but very interesting, examination of the sources for a life of Euripides, then a full appreciation of the chief plays in chronological order. There is throughout a certain freshness of mind which often brings out very cogently points which we overlook or take for granted; as of the *Hippolytus*, 'The story which might so easily be made ugly or sensual is treated by Euripides with a delicate and austere purity' (p. 87). Especially good are the remarks at the end on the *Deus ex machina* and on the chorus, and the whole book gives a convincing account of the development of Euripides, which, though not controversial, forms an answer to Dr. Verrall's theory, which is only mentioned, incidentally, in the bibliography at the end. Briefly,

the attack on conventional theology is traced to the mysticism rather than to the rationalism of Euripides and it is in this light that we should take the protests against the superstitions, follies and worldliness of his age. Of the *Bacchae* Prof. Murray writes: 'We have in the *Bacchae*—it seems to me impossible to deny it—a heartfelt glorifi-

cation of "Dionysus." No doubt it is Dionysus in some private sense of the poet's own; something opposed to "the world"; some spirit of the wild woods and the sunrise, of inspiration and untrammelled life' (p. 188), but of course he sees in it nothing which may rightly be called a recantation.

R. B. APPLETON.

OBITUARY

By the death of Mr. R. C. Seaton the *Classical Review* has lost one of its most regular contributors, and classical learning a scholar of distinction. Mr. Seaton was born in 1852, educated at Shrewsbury School under Dr. Moss, and Jesus College, Cambridge, of which he was first Scholar and afterwards Fellow, having taken a first-class in the Classical Tripos of 1876. For a few years he practised at the Bar, to which he was called by Lincoln's Inn, then he became a schoolmaster at Dulwich College and afterwards at St. Paul's School, where he remained for over twenty years, and has left behind him a reputation for good scholarship and patient teaching. On retiring from St. Paul's he devoted a large amount of his time to the interests of the Classical Association, in which he was keenly interested: the Association remembers with gratitude the valuable services that he rendered when he held the office of Treasurer.

Mr. Seaton is best known among Classical men as an authority on Apollonius Rhodius, whom he edited in the new Oxford text and in the Loeb series. He had long intended to bring out a large annotated edition of Apollonius, and for this purpose had collected an immense amount of material and made himself most intimately acquainted with his author's use of words. But other interests delayed the completion of the work, and in 1912 he was anticipated by the publication of Mr. Mooney's excellent edition, to which he paid a generous tribute in his review of the book in the *Classical Review* of February, 1914. Evidence of Mr. Seaton's acquaintance with the criticism of Apollonius was given from time to time by notes and articles, not only in the

Classical Review of 1905 (where he reviews Mr. Oswald's dissertation on the use of Prepositions in Apollonius) and of 1911 (where he criticises some rash emendations proposed by Mr. G. Boesch). It is a serious loss to classical scholarship that Mr. Seaton never published the complete result of his researches. In later years he had begun to despair of ever doing so, but had he lived he would have published an annotated edition of Book III.

We have spoken of other interests which prevented the completion of the edition of Apollonius. They were many and various. Mr. Seaton was a sound and learned grammarian, and frequently contributed to the discussion of grammatical points; he was also a skilful compositor, especially of Greek Elegiacs, and many of his versions have appeared in the pages of this *Review*. But his interests were not classical only. He acquired no mean reputation for his work on Napoleon, on whom he may be regarded as an authority. In two volumes he vindicated the character of Sir Hudson Lowe (to whose family papers he had access) against the attacks of certain historians. He also supported the cause of Tariff Reform by a volume entitled *Power and Plenty*.

Finally, in addition to much arduous work for the Classical Association, he took a keen interest in Catholic education, and was on the council of St. Edmund's House, Cambridge, and of the Universities' Catholic Education Board. His loss will be mourned by many who, besides admiring his versatile activity and clarity of thought as a writer, have had the privilege of knowing him as a loyal and warm-hearted friend.

C. G. BOTTING.

NOTES AND NEWS

WE learn that the Belgian quarterly, *Le Muséon*, is to be published shortly at the Cambridge University Press. We have not been informed of its contents: they are chiefly Oriental as a rule, and Professor de la Vallée Poussin, who is now in Cambridge with many of his colleagues, is known as a high authority on Buddhism. But we hope our readers may find something of interest in it for themselves.

We have received the following :

Bacidis uel potius fortasse Sibyllae
Cumanae hocce oraculum Germanorum
nempe classi exitium denuntiantis,
itemque Epigramma Caesari Gulielmo
Secundo in maiorem gloriam monumento
inscribendum (ideoque fortasse uersiculis
Elegiacis conscriptum), nondum illud
quidem in Papyro ququam Oxyrhyncensi
reperitum, ex Palimpsesto qui apud se
ipsum conditus rebus nuperrime gestis
retractus est, in lucem edidit, Anglice
reddidit, Germanorum, Wilamowitzii
praesertim, eruditioni commendauit
IOHANNES MACNAUGHTON, in Vniuersitate
Regiomontana Canadensium Litt. Graecarum
et Latinarum Professor Ordinarius.

Αὐτοφόνον τοι Τευτονικοῦ μέγα χρῆμ'
ἀπολείται

ἀγριόδοντος ὕος, εἰς ἅλ' ἐπὴν καταβῇ.
Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει νήχειν τό γε, καὶ σθένει
βλεμέαινον,
ἅλλ' ὀνύχουσιν εὐὸς λαιμότομον κατέδν.

Quoth Thomas of Ercildoune or, as it
well mote be, Mother Shipton, in whom
is truly less rhyme but perchance there-
for the more reason :

If e'er he plunge in briny tide,
The Prussian Pig makes suicide.
For why? He hath no skill to swim :
A claw-cut throat's the end of him.

A paper was recently read to the
Northumberland and Durham Classical
Association by Mr. M. S. Thompson on
'Methods and Aims of Modern Archaeo-
logy.' Every ancient civilisation (said
the reader) has its own special problems,
and special methods are required to solve
them. The main problems before the ex-
cavator in Greece can be seen by exam-
ining the kind of evidence with which he
has to deal. The public buildings of

Greece, built of stone or marble, have
mostly disappeared through human
agency. Marble is convertible into lime,
and the metal clamps used to join the
stones together were worth removing.
The private buildings, in which mud brick
was largely used, perished rapidly by
natural decay and constantly had to be
rebuilt. They have, however, left behind
layer upon layer of débris, which is most
valuable for the archaeologist. Precious
metals are always hard to find, but the
common metals, bronze and iron, in
Greek soil soon decay. Of all archaeo-
logical evidence pottery is the most
valuable; it is very common, and a
vase once broken lasts for ever in frag-
ments. Modern archaeology begins
with Schliemann, who was the first to
study pottery. Before his time archaeo-
logy was largely a treasure hunt; now its
object is to preserve all possible histor-
ical evidence. Since Schliemann's time
there has been a great advance in the
methods used both in excavation and
in preserving the objects when found.
The paper ended with an account of a
few recent excavations to illustrate rigid
and minute scrutiny to which the sacred
earth of ancient settlements is subjected.

Those who were privileged to hear
Sir Archibald Geikie's address to the
London Branch of the Classical Associa-
tion will be glad to read again what is
practically the same lecture in the cur-
rent number of the *Quarterly Review*.
Those who now read for the first time
the description of the storm on the
Lago di Garda will realise perhaps
more fully than they have ever done
before what a master of English prose
the late President of the Association is.
A discussion followed the lecture, in
which Professor Ramsay maintained
that Catullus, when he settled down at
Sirmio, was very glad to have done with
seafaring; Sir Archibald Geikie held, on
the contrary, that he laid up his old ship
with regret. Members who heard him
will not easily forget the verve with
which he clinched the argument: 'And
I am a yachtsman, and I know.'

We have received, and propose to
notice later, the Proceedings of the
Bombay Classical Association.

VERSION

Come, Peace! not like a mourner
bowed

For honour lost and dear ones wasted,
But proud, to meet a people proud,

With eyes that tell of triumph tasted!

Come, with hand gripping on the hilt,
And step that proves you Victory's
daughter!

Longing for you, our spirits wilt

Like shipwrecked men's on rafts for
water.

Come, while our country feels the lift

Of a great instinct shouting for-
wards,

And knows that freedom's ne'er a gift

That tarries long in hands of cowards!

Come, such as mothers prayed for,
when

They kissed their cross with lips that
quivered,

And bring fair wages for brave men,

A nation saved, a race delivered!

LOWELL.

ἔλθε μὲν, εἰρήνη· σὺ δὲ μὴ κλέος
ὡς ἄρ' ὄλωλεν

μηδὲ μάτην φθιμένους ἔλθ' ὀλοφυρομένη,
ἀλλὰ μέγ' ἐν φρονέουσιν μέγα φρονέουσα

φανείης,

ὧν ἑπαθες δεινὰς οἶα λαβοῦσα δίκας·

ἔλθ' Ἀρέα πνέουσ' ἐγχεσπάλυν, ὡς ἐπὶ
νίκῃ,

ἰσχυῖ δ' ἢ σ' ἔτεκεν νῦν ἔτ' ἀγαλλομένη·
πάντες γὰρ δὴ σείο χατίζομεν, ὡς ὅτε

ἰαῦται

ἐν πόντῳ ὕδατος δηρὸν ἀτεμβόμενοι.

δεῦρ' ἴθι· νῦν γάρ τοι ξυνῇ μάλα πάντες
ἄμ' ὀρμῇ

χωρόομεν, θείην ἐν φρεσὶ θέντες ὅπα,

εἰδότες ὡς οὐ δηρὸν ἐν ἀνδρασιν ἀπτο-
λέμοισιν

ἔμπεδον ἔστ' ἐρατῆς δῶρον ἐλευθερίας·

ἔλθ' οἷς ἐπὶ παισὶ γυνή στέργουσα θανοῦσι
πολλάκις ἀντ' ἀχέων ἐλλιτάνευσε

τυχεῖν,

ἔλθε πόλεως ἀλκῇ σώτειρα τε πατρίδος
αἵης·

καλὸς ὁδ' ἐστ' ἀνδρῶν μισθὸς ἀγνορίας.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Caesar (de Bello Civili II.) Edited by A. G. Peskett. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " × 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii+88. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

Cocchia (E.) *Introduzione Storica allo Studio della Letteratura Moderna*. 8" × 5". Pp. viii+382. Bari: G. Laterza and Figli, 1915. L. 5.

Eitrem (S.) *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* von S. E. Utgit for H. A. Benneches Fond. 10 $\frac{3}{8}$ " × 7". Pp. 496. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1915. 15s.

Granger (F.) *Via Romana. A First Latin Course on the Direct Method*. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 5". Pp. x+132. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1915. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Hammond (B. E.) *Bodies Politic and their Governments*. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 6". Pp. x+560. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Homer (Odyssey). Books VI., VII. Edited by G. M. Edwards. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " × 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xviii+72. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s.

Leach (A. F.) *The Schools of Medieval England* ('The Antiquaries' Books'). With 43 illustrations. 9" × 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xv+349.

London: Methuen and Co., 1915. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Molinier (S.) *Les 'maisons sacrées' de Délos, au temps de l'indépendance de l'île, 315-166/5 av. J. C.* (Université de Paris, Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, xxxi.) 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 108. Paris: F. Alcan, 1915. Fr. 5.

Niccolini (G.) *La Confederazione Achea: Studi Storici*. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 6". Pp. xii+348. Pavia: Mattei and Co., 1914.

Proceedings of the Bombay Branch of the Classical Association, 1914. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 68. Rs. 1.8 net.

Ramsay (G. G.) *The Histories of Tacitus. An English Translation, with Introduction, Frontispiece, Notes, Maps, and Index*. 9" × 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. lxxv+463. London: John Murray, 1915. Cloth, 15s.

Rudberg (Gunnar) *Neutestamentlicher Text und Nomina Sacra, von G. R. Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanista Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 17.3.* 9" × 6". Pp. 88. Uppsala: A. B. Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: O. Hassarowitz.

Seneca. Dialogues X., XI., XII. Edited by J. D. Duff. 7" × 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. lxx+312. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 4s. net.

ERRATUM.

On p. 11, column 2, line 24 from bottom, *for οὔνεκεν ἀλλήλων read οὔνεκεν Ἑλλήνων.*

The Classical Review

MAY, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

CLENARD AS AN EDUCATIONAL PIONEER.

I.

THE Age of the Italian Renaissance is often characterised as that of the development of strong individualities. This designation is equally true for the Northern Renaissance. If we consider the single instance of the University of Louvain, at the time when Erasmus undertook the direction of Busleiden's foundation of the College of the Three Languages (the Collegium trilingue), we recognise that Erasmus himself, the great Prince of all intellectual Europe, was the centre of a group, each member of which was of outstanding force of character. It has been said of Erasmus, after he settled at Basle—'before the sickly scholar of Basle—throwing on every controversy of the age the light of his genius and his learning, though too cautious to take a decisive part in any, the derider of monks who yet claved to the Church, the Reformer who shrank from reform, the humanist who would not desert the Papacy—all Europe bowed.'¹

In Erasmus's group at Louvain were such men as Martin Dorpius, Alaert of Amsterdam, Borsalus, Jacques Latomus or Masson, Juan Custor or de Coster, Jacques Ceratinus or van Horn, François de Craneveld, Jean Paludan or du Marais, Herman Westphalus, Adrian

Suesonius, Rutger Rescius, Conrad Goclenius, Adrian Barlandus, Melchior Trevir, John Naevius, Thierry Martens, Pierre Barbirius, Guy Morillon, to say nothing of his old tutor Adrian Florent (afterwards Adrian VI., the single Belgian Pope), Peter Gilles, the town-clerk of Antwerp—and his Spanish-born friend, the scholar Juan Luis Vives. All these, and there were many others, were both friends and admirers of Erasmus. Yet it might be shown that each of them had his own distinction, a marked individuality. Indeed, it may be said to have been a special glory of Erasmus, that though he had so fascinating a personality as a teacher, he founded no school. All who came under his influence were encouraged along the lines of their own individuality. In the world of scholarship and education, at any rate, Erasmus accepted no orthodoxy, and he imposed none on those who came near him. Hence the brilliant freedom of enterprise in which the Louvain scholars, under the influence of Erasmus, pursued the fulfilment of their inner promptings, only bound by the unity of intellectual endeavour towards truth and fuller humanism. It is true that there were limits to Erasmus's sympathies. Thus when Juan Luis Vives carried his spiritual longings into the practical paths of women's education and afterwards of social amelioration, and in his anxiety to proclaim his views far and wide composed

¹ Charles Beard, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Hibbert Lectures, 1883), p. 65.

his works, as it seemed to Erasmus, with less regard to style and elaboration of composition than he might have done, had he given more time and labour to finished Latinity: Erasmus reproved him, and even appears to have become by degrees alienated from Vives, who showed no penitence, and cared more for his subject-matter—i.e., for the amelioration of social conditions—than for scholarly faultlessness of expositions, in works addressed as clearly as he could devise for the understanding of people at large.

Similarly, Nicholas Cleynaerts or Clenardus came under the direct influence of Erasmus, who was settled at Louvain from 1519 to 1521 in connection with the College of the Three Languages. In 1519 Clenard, who was a native of Diest, became *licencié* in theology, having studied under Jacobus Latomus. Though Clenard himself says 'non sum grandis theologus,' yet he imbibed the spirit of what may be called practical, and also literary, theology. He cared for the humanism of Christianity, and he cared for the literary merits of the Christian documents—viz., the books of the Holy Scriptures—in which Christianity was to be made known to the world. His studies included Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic, and later, as we shall see, Arabic. Clenard was, if we may use the term, in his early education, entirely a product of Louvain. Born at Diest, near to Louvain, on the eve of St. Nicholas, it is inferred, in 1493, he would thus be sixteen years of age when he obtained his licence in theology, and seventeen years of age in 1520, when he obtained permission to teach publicly and privately Greek and Hebrew. His public lectures, it is stated, were delivered in the Collège de Houterlé at Louvain. Apparently Clenard taught and studied there during the years 1520 to 1530, living more and more in a world of imagination kindled into flame by the study of Hebrew and Chaldaic, though no man was more indefatigable in reflecting on the practical problems of teaching privately the Latin language and publicly the Greek.

Erasmus left Louvain in 1521, but for two years, the impressionable years

between sixteen and eighteen, Clenard probably saw much of him, for he was in close touch with John Campensis, who taught Hebrew at Erasmus's College of the Three Languages, and at any rate, Clenard was breathing in the joyful atmosphere of the study of the 'good authors' of antiquity and in the new theological spirit of Erasmus, who insisted on the application of the literary analysis and criticism of the humanists—to the study of the books of the Bible. In 1536 the leader of European scholarship, Desiderius Erasmus, died. Clenard, at the time, in Spain, was utterly distressed, but summoned courage to write an ode, addressed to his friend de Resende, the Portuguese humanist, on the death of the great Erasmus, in which he says:

Divinos docuit volvere codices,
Et sensus retulit fortior integros,
Splendorem tabulis restituit sacris :
Luge concio mystica.

* * * *

Quid frustra superûm frangere gaudia
Lamentis properas tuis ?
Nam Desiderium ferre diutius,
Mortales inter taedia noxia,
Ingratum fuerat cernere caelites,
Sydus quòd cuperent novum.
Qua propter positis desine naeniis
Victori egregio condere funera :
Sed mecum modulis laetus amantibus
Cura pangere caelitem.

In his *Epistolae* (Plantin edition, p. 76, *et seqq.*) Clenard's grief at Erasmus's death finds further expression. Other references in the *Epistolae* show that Clenard had never forgotten his Louvain acquaintance with Erasmus's views. In one passage (*ibid.*, p. 103) Clenard appreciatively dwells upon Erasmus's special service to humanism in editing the Greek New Testament, and furnishing his Paraphrase of it. Clenard does not hesitate to state that his ambition is to do for an Arabic text of the New Testament what Erasmus had done for the Greek. We cannot doubt, therefore, the direct debt of suggestion received by Clenard from Erasmus. We are all the more surprised to observe the difference of the tasks which Clenard imposed upon himself from those of Erasmus.

We do not, ordinarily, realise how much of Erasmus's life-task consisted

in the editing of texts of the old authors. But such a rough list as the following (incomplete though it be) at least draws attention to this aspect: 1505, Valla's *Notes on the Latin Text of the New Testament*; 1506, Euripides: *Hecuba et Iphigenia* and Luciani *Dialogi*; 1509, Cicero: *de Amicitia, de Senectute, et Paradoxa*; 1513, Aesop: *Fabulae*; 1514, Cato: *Distichia moralia*; 1516, *Novum Instrumentum* (i.e., the New Testament); 1516, Jerome: *Opera Omnia*; 1518, Athanasius: *Commentarii in Epistolas Pauli*; 1518, Basil: *Notes on the Psalms*; 1518, Quintus Curtius: *de rebus gestis*.

All these were published by the time that Clenard came to know Erasmus at Louvain. In 1520 Erasmus published Cyprian: *Opera*; in the same year, 1522, Arnobius on the Psalms. In 1522, also, was published J. L. Vives' edition of the *de Civitate Dei* of St. Augustine, written, with its elaborate notes, at the suggestion of Erasmus. Some of the more original and now far better known works of Erasmus, not concerned with the editing of texts, were the *Adagia*, 1500; the *Enchiridion militis christiani*, 1503; the *de Copia*, 1511; the *Moriae encomium*, 1511; *Concio de puero Jesu*, 1514; *Institutio principis christiani*, 1515; the *Colloquia*, 1516; the *Paraclesis id est adhortatio ad christianae philosophiae studium*, 1516; *Querela pacis*, 1517; *Bellum*, 1517; *Antibarborum liber unus*, 1518; *Apologiae duae contra Latomum*, 1518; *aliquot declamatiunculae Graecae*; *Eademque Latine*, 1519; and the epoch-making *Ratio seu compendium verae theologiae*, 1519; *de Conscribendis Epistolis*, 1520; *de Contemptu mundi*, 1521.

From an examination of the above representative, but not exhaustive, list, it will be seen that the main interest of Erasmus, up to and including the time that he left Louvain (he was there, we remember, from 1519 to 1521), was the editing of classical texts, the interpretation of classical texts, and the thorough preparation of textbooks, helpful for composition and speech, with the phraseology and subject-matter of the classical authors. We see the suggestive influence of Erasmus in this direction in the enormous commentary of J. L.

Vives, *de civitate Dei* of St. Augustine, though the spirit in which he composed his laborious work was distinctly independent of any work of Erasmus, and highly individualistic.

The independence of Nicholas Clenard in his educational life-work is still more marked, great as was his admiration of Erasmus. Like Vives, Clenard was a private teacher at Louvain, and both Vives and Clenard were more closely concerned with pedagogic methods and processes than was Erasmus. It is true Erasmus had once occupied his mind over the compilation of a Latin grammar. William Lily's original draft of his grammar was, as Erasmus says, 'thrust upon me for emendation.'¹ But in the years of public and private teaching of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew grammar Clenard became not only skilled, but also enthusiastic, in his observations of the most effective methods of the teaching of languages at their earliest stages. Erasmus, we may say with reason, was much more interested in understanding the higher stages of study, in inspiring the critical attitude towards knowledge. Clenard felt the keenest pedagogic joy in watching the psychological effects of different teaching methods, in noting results, and after comparison, deliberately and scientifically, accepting the most effective. Above all, his joy was supreme in arousing the pleasure in the exertion of the active powers of the pupil, in coming to his own, intellectually. He believed that success in teaching was not accidental, but was the result of a well-thought-out method. Hence, whilst both Erasmus and Clenard wished to attain the same end—viz., the leading of the pupil to a development of concentrated studies in humanist subjects—they differed in the emphasis

¹ Erasmus says: 'I emended the book by changing many things. Lily (endowed as he is with too much modesty) did not permit the book to appear with his name, and I (with my sense of candour) did not feel justified that the book should bear my name when it was the work of another. Since both of us refused our names, it was published *ἀνώνυμος*.' This letter was published in the *Absolutissimus de octo orationis partium constructione libellus*. Basle, 1515.

they laid the one on the earlier, the other on the later, stages of instruction. Whilst Erasmus gave himself to the writing of texts, as his main pedagogic

interest, Clenard was absorbed in the seemingly more mechanical, and more humble, task of the preparation of grammatical textbooks.

NOTE ON EURIPIDES, *HERCULES FURENS*, 773-780.

θεοὶ θεοὶ
τῶν ἀδίκων μέλουσι καὶ
τῶν ὁσίων ἐπάειν.
ὁ χρόσος ἅ τ' εὐτυχία
†φρονεῖν† βροτοὺς ἐξάγεται,
δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων.
χρόνου δ' ἄρ' οὐ τὸ πάλιν ἔτλα τις
εἰσορῶν—
νόμον παρέμενος ἀνομία χάριν διδούς
ἔθραυσεν ὄλ-
βον κελαινὸν ἄρμα.

IN 778 I have printed Headlam's reading (see *J. Ph.* XXX., p. 297 sq.). The text is, as Murray remarks, uncertain; but Headlam showed good reason for holding that χρόνου τὸ πάλιν means 'time's reverse,' and is like the παλιντυχῆς τριβὰ βίου of *Ag.* 471, since much of this chorus recalls that famous passage. He also remarked that τις must be the spectator of the sinner's ruin, which is described in the last sentence. The horses to which the sinner gives the reins (ἀνομία χάριν διδούς) bolt, and so the car of prosperity becomes a car of black destruction (κελαινὸν also recalls *Ag.* 470), and is dashed to pieces. All this seems certain, and we need not trouble further about such suggestions as χρόνου ῥόπαλον. But in 775, where the MSS. have φρονεῖν, I venture to think that the generally accepted correction to φρενῶν (Dindorf) is wrong. Having in mind the familiar idea that great prosperity drives men out of their senses, and knowing that φρονεῖν could only mean in this construction 'to be sensible,' editors agree in reading φρενῶν and translating 'Gold and prosperity draw a man on away from his right mind,' 'make him lose self-control.' Wilamowitz points out that if this is the meaning the middle ἐπάγεται is irregular, and further that we are

driven to translate ἐφέλκων as if it were a middle. He contents himself with suggesting a sort of Enallage—in plain words that Euripides has made two wrongs equal to two rights. But all this trouble is due to the notion that we have to read φρενῶν.

Now there is another idea, also common in Greek, more appropriate to the present passage than the notion that prosperity turns the head of the wealthy man. The chorus are triumphing over the downfall of the usurper Lycus. His sin began not from his pride and wantonness in prosperity, but because he envied a king and therefore slew him and seized his wealth and throne. Though Euripides naturally makes his chorus recall *Ag.* 381 in their cry 'God really does punish sin,' and *Ag.* 470-1 in their description of the later stages of Lycus' folly and fall, he also, I suggest, makes the lyric relevant to Lycus and his crime of usurpation. *Oed. Tyr.* 380 gives us the idea we want:

ὦ πλοῦτε καὶ τυραννί . . .
ὅσος παρ' ὑμῖν ὁ φθόνος φυλάσσεται . . .

'if even Creon can be seduced into an attempt at usurpation.' It is the nature of great prosperity not only to turn the head of the owner, but to excite the envy of the beholder and make him an ambitious plotter. So Lycus was led on to envy by the prosperity of Creon, therefore usurped a δύνασιν ἄδικον, then went from bad to worse. 'Having thrown law on one side' (aorist) by his act of usurpation, he then 'gave the reins to his lawlessness' (present) in the treatment of the family of Heracles, and by this conduct comes to ruin.

Read, therefore, φθονεῖν (for corruption of this type cf. Cobet *N. L.*, p. 404). The sense we want is: 'The sight of

prosperity and gold makes men envious, and thus leads to (brings in its train) tyranny, usurping against right. But time brings a terrible reversal and retribution, which none can bear to look upon. The usurper goes from bad to worse, and finally wrecks the chariot of his good fortune.' *φθόνος* from other men is the stock result of greatness, and *κέρδος*, the desire for unjust gain, is the stock motive for usurpers, plotters and tyrants.

Read *φθονεῖν* and you have this sense. But also you have made the middle of *ἐπάγεται* (gold makes a man envy it: cf. Xen. *Hiero* IX. 11), and the active *ἐφέλκων* correct. Further you have an

infinitive which is normal, instead of the unusual *φρενῶν*, to follow *ἐπάγεται*. Above all, the sentence now describes what actually happened to Lycus, who was led into the tyrant's ruin by covetous ambition which made him seize another man's power and gold. The familiarity of the thought that a good king comes to his power as a great benefactor (see e.g. Aristotle *Pol.* III. 14, 11, 1285b Newman) makes this account of the tyrannical rise of Lycus a suitable contrast to the tribute which is now paid to his overthrower Heracles.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

PLATO, PHAEDO 62A.

THIS passage has recently been handled by Professor Burnet in his edition of the dialogue and by Miss Taylor (*C.R.*, xxvii, p. 193), who, though differing on certain points, agree in holding that the much-discussed sentence falls into two structurally independent parts of which the first ends with the word *ζῆν*. I venture, with all respect, to submit a reason for taking another view, since I find that my sense of idiom instinctively revolts against such a division of the sentence.

In the mouth of the great Ironist, the opening words, *ἴσως θαυμαστόν σοι φανέται εἶ*, lead me irresistibly to expect a proposition which is not only paradoxical but also approved or at least regarded as tenable by the speaker: indeed it will surprise me if the proposition is not practically identical with the conclusion in which the discussion of the topic is to terminate. If the sentence is to be bisected at *ζῆν, εἶ* here introduces two propositions connected by *καί*; but as it is generally admitted that the second is explanatory of the first (*καί* = 'that is'), we are justified in treating the words as a single proposition, which amounts to this: 'it is true without exception that death is never preferable to life.' Now this statement would indeed seem para-

doxical to a Greek, as numerous passages could be adduced to prove; but it fails altogether to satisfy my second requirement, since Socrates himself, far from regarding it as tenable, is convinced of the exact contrary.

Now when the discussion of the immediate topic—the lawfulness of suicide—is concluded at 62c, the view which both speakers agree to regard as reasonable, though not demonstrable, is that suicide is not permitted. It is true that this view is indicated clearly enough in the second part of the sentence, taken by itself. But what becomes of the connexion between the two parts of the sentence? Stripped of the unessential, the rendering offered by Professor Burnet amounts to this: 'Perhaps you may think it strange that in this matter there should be no exceptional cases; and perhaps you think it strange that in the exceptional cases a man must not kill himself.' That is to say, the same, or practically the same, formula is used to introduce two propositions which bear an entirely different relation to the argument: and what becomes of Plato's style? Professor Burnet should surely excise *σοι φανέται*.

Miss Taylor's interpretation is not open to this objection. Understanding

τοῦτο to mean τὸ μὴ θεμιτὸν εἶναι ἑαυτὸν ἀποκτεινύναι, she makes καὶ practically equivalent to 'which involves the assumption that.' I find it difficult to read the words in this way; and if this criticism be unduly subjective, it remains true that upon her view the last part of the passage, from οἷς δὲ βέλτιον onward, is a restatement of the first part, from ἴσως μέντοι to ἀπλοῦν ἔστιν, and should therefore not be introduced by δέ, but asyndetically or with γάρ or καί.

But there is another possibility. It is well known that such phrases as θαυμαστὸν εἶ, δεινὸν εἶ, frequently introduce a pair of inconsistent or apparently inconsistent propositions, of which the first is admitted to be true. In the present case a pair of such propositions which would satisfy all the requirements of the context would be: 'You may think it strange if, though death is sometimes better than life, it is never permissible to commit suicide.' In a simple form this would appear in Greek as θαυμαστὸν ἴσως σοι φανέται εἰ ἔστι μὲν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν, οἷς δὲ βέλτιον τεθνάναι τούτοις μὴ ὅσιον αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοὺς εὖ ποιεῖν. Another way of expressing the same thought would be the words given by the MSS. as far as ζῆν (with μὲν added after ἔστιν), followed by οἷς δὲ βέλτιον τεθνάναι τούτοις ὅσιον ὃν αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοὺς εὖ ποιεῖν. (In this case of course the propositions introduced by μὲν and δέ are not inconsistent.) The sort of *contaminatio* of these two forms which the text presents is to be explained as follows; the speaker embarks upon the first form and slips into the second

through the well-known Greek tendency to restate in a negative form what has been already stated positively; but when he reaches the second member he feels, as I should feel, that the effect given by the construction of τυγχάνει will not be felicitous, and accordingly returns to the structure originally conceived, repeating the opening phrase to avoid misconception. The appearance of awkwardness in this will be reduced if we bear in mind the many cases in which a positive clause is followed by a negative restatement and the subsequent construction ignores the interposition of the latter. The sentence thus produced has undoubtedly a confusing effect upon a grammatically trained reader; but, if I am not mistaken, it can be delivered orally so as to leave no such impression on the mind of a listener, even if prejudiced by grammatical study, at any rate if a slight alteration of the text be made. The introduction of the τυγχάνει-construction perhaps makes the point doubtful, but my feeling is that μὲν is here indispensable, and I would accordingly read ἔστι <μὲν> ὅτε καὶ οἷς.

This view involves the interpretation of τοῦτο as τὸ μὴ θεμιτὸν εἶναι ἑαυτὸν ἀποκτεινύναι. Miss Taylor has disposed of Professor Burnet's objections to this interpretation; but I may add that if it involves an absurd suggestion, Professor Burnet's own view involves a similar one—that the only universal truth admitting of no distinction is the assertion that death is never preferable to life.

G. A. DAVIES.

Glasgow University.

THE WATER GODS AND AENEAS IN THE TWENTIETH AND TWENTY-FIRST BOOKS OF THE *ILIAD*.

THE title of this paper should properly include the mountain gods of the Northerners and Achilles who fights under their protection. For the point which I desire to establish is that, to a degree hitherto unnoted, there exists in these two books of the *Iliad* an anti-

thesis between gods of the height and gods of the stream, which has behind it a long tale of fighting between the invading Northmen, worshippers of the Achaean Sky-God, and of his Valkyrie daughter Athena, and the river-worshipping tribes, extending from the Danube

on to Troy, where the Northmen won their last great victory, and their gods triumphed. Dr. Leaf says, in his recent book on Homeric geography, that 'the tale of Troy must from the first have been limited by a tradition of real facts,'¹ and in his opinion there must have existed a real record of real events from which the *Iliad* grew. Whether this *Iliad* as we have it is a single or a composite work, only one who is of so dull a mind as to confuse poetry and history can fail to see that this epic does not tell merely facts about the great final struggle of Achaeans and Trojans, but is enriched by all the tumultuous experience of many 'far-off things,' and battles fought with many fierce tribes from the Iron Gate onward.

The deity who more than all others watches over the Achaean warriors in the *Iliad* is Athena. Her name, I believe, has never been better translated than by Ruskin² in his *Spirit of the Air*. I cannot agree either with Gilbert Murray³ in his statement that 'Ἀθήνη seems most likely to mean Attic, nor with Gruppe⁴ in his translation of Ἀθήνη as 'the unsuckled.' I connect the name rather with the root seen in ἀθήρ, point, and Ἄθως, the name of that shining marble mountain that is believed by the Lemnians to cast its shadow on Lemnos, fifty miles away, and has always been a weather-mountain, ὄρος σημαντικόν, like Olympus. Athena is pre-eminently the goddess of the Achaean highlanders, worshipped on heights,⁵ and is indeed the incarnation of their warlike prowess and strategy.

Her name γλαυκῶπις has, in its origin, nothing to do with the owl, but like ἐλικῶπες, descriptive of the Achaeans, marks the impression made by the fierce grey-blue northern eye upon a southern people; Caesar and Tacitus alike bear testimony to the terrifying effect of that steel-blue glance, the 'acies oculorum' of the fair-haired

warriors of Central Europe on their dark Italian foes.

In these two books of the *Iliad* we find the Olympians divided. On the Trojan side are all the gods who have to do with water. Even Poseidon leaves his Greeks, and with an apology to Hera helps the cause of the worshippers of water-gods. Aphrodite, Artemis, Apollo, all with affiliations with sea, stream, or marsh, are on the same side with Xanthus, the river-god. Athena and Hera, goddesses of the heights, are the mainstay of the Greeks, with Hephaestus, the fire-god, to aid them against the River.

The two books are entitled respectively *θεομαχία* and *μάχη παραποτόμιος*. The traditional title of the twentieth book is (as Dr. Leaf says) a complete misnomer, the real battle of the gods occurring in the twenty-first book in a passage which Dr. Leaf is right in pronouncing one of the few poetically bad passages of the *Iliad*. The fight with the river is condemned by M. Breal⁶ with characteristically French dislike of elemental wildness. To what we sometimes call Anglo-Saxon or Teutonic taste the scene is one of extraordinary splendour. If it is an interpolation or expansion, as many hold it to be, its poet has immeasurably raised the tone of the two books of which it forms the most remarkable and unforgettable part. Consider the other episodes of these eminently episodic books. The two *θεομαχίαι* are as bad as possible. In spite of their⁷ undeniable style and pretty touches like that of Artemis,⁷ 'full of tears, fleeing like a wood-pigeon,' they are in such taste that only the incorrigible lover of buffoonery could care for them. Then there is the long Aeneas episode. Even Andrew Lang comes near to thinking this an interpolation. He would be suspicious of it, he says in his last book on Homer, 'if Aeneas were not throughout such a special sort of person.' The Lycaon episode is of high poetic merit, and in my belief has an intimate relation to the main theme of the book, the sub-

¹ *Troy: a Study in Homeric Geography*, p. 328.

² *Aratra Pentelici*, p. 103.

³ *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 72.

⁴ *Greek Myths*, iii., p. 1194.

⁵ πόλεων δὲ πασῶν τὰς κορυφὰς ἔχει κατὰ κράτος (Arist., vol. i., p. 15). See Farnell, *Greek Cults*, i., pp. 301, 302.

⁶ *Pour mieux connaître Homère*, p. 114.

⁷ From Gilbert Murray's *Rise of Greek Epic*, p. 242.

jugation of the River. This theme, I believe, is suggested at the beginning of the twentieth book, and forms the culmination of the contest between the Achaean gods of the height, and their champion Achilles and the water deities, who fight for and favour Troy.

At the beginning of Book XX. a council is called in heaven, to which strange deities are summoned. 'No river came not, nor Oceanus, nor nymph, haunting fair glade, or river-heads, or grassy meadow.' All gather to the shining colonnades of heaven. 'Not even the Earth-Shaker failed to heed the summons and came from out the sea to join them.' The particular mention of all the water deities here has caused Heyne to suggest that the lines 7-9 are an interpolation to account for the presence of the River Skamander in the Theomachy. As I hope to show in the following argument the lines are set at the head and front of these two books to stamp the nature of the contest that follows—not the foolish and vulgar theomachies, but the struggles of tribal gods and their worshippers.

In the twentieth book the long Aeneas episode occupies the chief place. This emphasizes the strife existing between the Trojans proper and Dardanian Aeneas, and contains the famous prophecy that the house of Aeneas shall continue to reign in the Troad even to the third and fourth generation.

Poseidon, who has been heretofore active in the Greek behalf, and in this very book has given Hera to believe that he will help Achilles against Aeneas now suffers a sea-change, and stricken with grief at the thought of Aeneas dying for the sins of Priam's house, he lifts him bodily from the ground and hurls him far back into the Trojan host. It should by all logic have been Apollo who performed this service for him, as he had urged him on to fight. His mother Aphrodite, too, has been on the battlefield. Poseidon's rescue of Aeneas, his praise of Aeneas' piety towards the gods, and prophecy of continual sovereignty of his house have been recognized as pointing to some special Poseidon cult among the Aeneadae. This theory is strengthened if the descent and affiliations of the

family of Aeneas are considered. The powerful tribe of Dardani at the head of the Axios river had at an early period invaded the Troad, and had come into such close relations with Troy itself that Priam is constantly called in the *Iliad* *Δαρδανίδης*. Thraemer¹ holds that the sixth stratum at Troy represents the height of Dardan culture. In Homer the Dardans are allies of Troy, led by Aeneas and two of Antenor's sons. Aeneas, their prince,² is always at odds with Priam because he is slighted by him. The Dardans in Europe who planted this stock in the Troad, are of the Illyrian-Thracian stock to which their close neighbours and kinsmen the Paeonians belong. Of the Illyrian worship of rivers we are informed by ancient authority,³ and the Paeonian neighbours of the Dardani who, like them, were people of the Axios or Vardar River, are notable for their cult of rivers in historic times. In a previous paper I have endeavoured to prove the likelihood that the Paeonians gave the Greeks their God of Healing, the divine physician, Paean. It may be noted that the Dardanians too share the Paeonian knowledge of healing herbs. Dioscorides,⁴ of Amazarba, in his book *περὶ ὕλης ἱατρικῆς*, gives the names of several herbs from the Dardanian speech. Both Tomaschek and Kretschmar describe the Dardanians and Paeonians as kindred, both coming from the north-west into the Axios valley: The Dardans, under the leadership of the royal family of the Aeneadae, had early pressed further on the trade route that led by the Axios valley to the later Thessalonica, and then by land or sea had come into the Troad and gained a partial sovereignty at Troy itself if we may believe Homer. This route from Dardania and Paeonia runs 'straight along one of the great productive districts of Greek commerce.' (Leaf, *op. cit.* 278.) Aeneas, then, the great representative of this powerful European tribe of river-worshippers, has at Troy come into the circle of the water-goddess Aphrodite and her para-

¹ *P. W.* sub *Dardani*.

² *Il.* 13, 459-60.

³ Servius ad *Georg.* I. 12.

⁴ Tomaschek, *Die Alten Thraker*, II. 2.

mour Anchises. I refer for this view of Anchises to Sir Arthur Evans' article in *J.H.S.*, 1912. He counts Atthis, Adonis, Thammuz and Ilian Anchises as different hypostases of the same lover of the Anatolian nature-goddess. And it is to be noted that all the deities who intervene to save Aeneas are deities worshipped as water-gods—Aphrodite, Poseidon, Artemis, who is so often worshipped as goddess of streams, lakes, and marshes, and in places where Aphrodite is worshipped in such wise. Cf. Strabo 8 (p. 243), μεστὴ δ' ἐστὶ ἡ γῆ πᾶσα ἀρτεμισίων καὶ ἀφροδισίων καὶ νυμφαίων ἐν ἄλσεσιν ἀνθέων τὸ πολὺ διὰ τὴν εὐνδρίαν.

Apollo, that god of many aspects, Aeneas' other great divine friend, is a seafarer, worshipped as the dolphin god, and connected with Poseidon in the building of an earlier Troy.

Some have doubted that it is possible to prove in the case of Aeneas and the Dardans of the Troad the connection with the European Dardans. Homer does not speak of this connection. But we cannot argue from that that he did not know of the existence of the European tribe. Only once does he mention the Mysians of Europe, though the Mysians of the Troad appear so often in his verses. Thraemer (in *P.W.*, under *Dardani*) has given the evidence for the relationship of the European Dardani with those of the Troad. I will add a bit of evidence which so far as I know has not been noted. Bateia or Batieia is mentioned with some particularity as the place of assembling for the Trojan host, a place possessed of two names, one human, one divine. This place is said¹ to have been named from Bateia, wife of Dardanus. The name is Dardanian and Illyrian. The name Βάτων is one that occurs among the rulers of both tribes, and the *Et. Mag.* has the statement ἐγὼ δὲ εὖρον ἐν τοῖς ῥητορικοῖς τὴν λέξιν οἰκίαν τινα σημαίνουσαν ἀπὸ Βάτωνος ὀνομασμένην δεσπότην. The word Βάτος is given as Dacian in the *Herbarium* of Dioscorides.

As I have already stated Thraemer holds that in the sixth stratum the *Blüthezeit* of the Dardan culture at

Troy is represented. The seventh stratum, dated somewhere between 1000—700 B.C., shows a Danubian culture in vases, brooches, battle axes, hammers and chisels. Dr. Leaf unhesitatingly ascribes this to the Treres who, Strabo says, settled in the Troad after the days of Priam. H. Schmidt who has examined the objects critically for Dörpfeld's 'Troja und Ilion' regards the Trerian hypothesis as plausible but does not commit himself to it in the absence of further archaeological evidence. It is to be noted that the Treres are mentioned by Pliny² as close neighbours of the Dardani and Paeonians, and that the Dardanians as well as the Paeonians were workers in metal from an early time. In this seventh stratum I believe may be found another link connecting in some way the citadel of Troy with the Dardanians of whose connection with the Trojans Homer gives us such tantalizing glimpses. In the two brothers Dardanus and Iason who are reputed to have come to Samothrace, whence Dardanus came to settle in the Troad, we have in all probability a reminiscence of the actual tribal movement along the trade route described by Dr. Leaf on page 272 of the *Homeric Geography*. I call attention to the name of Iason and his connection with the cult of Samothrace as characteristic of the practice of medicine and mantic of which we hear from many sources in Illyria, Paeonia and Thrace.

In the twenty-first book Achilles is still more clearly the foe of the river-worshippers. In the Lykaon episode we have the taunt which first rouses the wrath of the River. Achilles says to Lykaon: 'Nor shall the fair-flowing River with his silver current aid thee, though ye sacrifice bulls continually to him and plunge with his waters living horses.' The angry River does not yet join the fray, but there comes on most fitly as champion the Paeonian Asteropaios, the grandson of the river Axios and of Akessamenos, the Healer. The River inspires the young hero with courage, and after giving his pedigree to Achilles he joins battle. 'My race' he

¹ Dion. Hal. I. 80.

² *N. H.* 4. 10. 35.

says 'is descended from the wide-flowing Axios, whose water is the fairest that flows upon the earth.' Dr. Leaf's comment on this in his *Homeric Geography* is noteworthy. He says 'But the praise given to the river Axios seems to imply more than a distant knowledge—something of affectionate and even religious admiration which has puzzled ancient and modern critics alike. There is no apparent reason why the Vardar should be spoken of in these terms; for the beauties of its great gorge, the Iron Gate, even if appreciated in ancient days, can by no stretch be held to explain the praise of its water. But the river had one claim on the Greeks that may serve to account for this special reverence. Rising in the upland plain of Kossowa, which breaks by a low and comparatively easy pass the elsewhere almost continuous barrier of the Balkan chain and approached from the Danube from the North by the valley of the Morawa, it offers the highway by which in all ages the peoples of Central Europe have entered the promised land of the south. By it, almost beyond a doubt, the Achæan invasion must have come. We can almost hear in the words 'its fairest water spreads over the earth' the sigh of relief with which the advance guard, after struggling through the long depth of the Iron Gate, saw the river opening out into the rich plain where afterward stood Thessalonica, and felt that for a time at least their goal was reached. It was at the mouth of the Axios that the legend of Pieria grew up; and closely connected with that must have been the worship of the River God who had brought them through the mountains of the north and settled them in their new home. When the Achæans had taken the next great step and exchanged Pieria for Hellas, the memory of this older time had been dimmed, and Homer has nothing to tell us about it; but we may in his passing praise of the Axios, see at least a dim reflection of that already prehistoric stage, if not an actual quotation from a yet more recent song.'

I have quoted Dr. Leaf's page in full because it explains so admirably the meaning of the river Axios in the time

of Achæan migration. One point, however, highly important for the interpretation of Books 20 and 21 of the *Iliad* he has not mentioned; *i.e.* that the Achæans had to fight their way through the territory of the very Dardans and Pæonians whom Achilles has for his chief combatants in these two books. They lived at the head of the Axios and possessed its valley. The River God was their divinity and hostile to the Achæans and their mountain gods. The old songs of which we find echoes in these books may then well have celebrated the desperate fighting along the Axios in the earlier days, when the Axios rose in his might with his stream choked with the bodies of Pæonians slain as did the Skamander in the twenty-first *Iliad*. It is noteworthy that the first victim of Patroclus in Achilles' armour is the Pæonian leader Pyraechmes of the Catalogue, that the wound of Patroclus is inflicted by a Dardan Euphorbus, though Hector the Trojan must have the glory of striking the final blow, that in the fight over Patroclus we find Aeneas, Apisaon from Pæonia, and Asteropaïos in close company. Here are the leaders of the Danubian river-folk pitted against the Achæan highlanders. It is true that Achilles became the 'chieftain of a long river valley'¹ and vows his lock to the Spercheius, but Dr. Leaf remarks that the River God is not an ancestor but 'enters in only in the generation after Peleus. In other words the family of Peleus is a late arrival and adopts the River God instead of descending from him as in the case of autochthonous princes.' Asteropaïos is an autochthonous prince. Of the interview between him and Achilles, Dr. Leaf says 'It is almost as though he said "If you have your Axios, I have my Achelous; but I scorn to base my ancestry on a mere river."'

The fight in the twenty-first book after the death of Asteropaïos goes on with the slaying of seven Pæonians whose names are given. 'And many Pæonians besides would swift-footed Achilles have slain had not the deep-eddying River in wrath assumed the

¹ T. W. Allen in *Classical Quarterly*, 1909.

likeness of a man and addressed Achilles.' Then comes the great passage where the river with his raging waters so nearly overwhelms Achilles that he cries to Zeus in agony of shame at the death that is on him, like a boy that herds the swine caught in a rising stream. The gods free him from peril. Hera sends Hephaestus to fight water with fire, and the River at bay swears to Hera not to aid Troy further if she will but stay her son from devastating his stream.

After this splendid scene comes the

trivial theomachy. Then Achilles begins his slaying again, attacking a Dardan, Agenor, son of Antenor, who is saved by Apollo, who takes the guise of Agenor.

The water gods are vanquished by the gods of the highlanders, who usurp their places so fully that Homer even fancies that Athena was worshipped at Troy during the famous siege. Here indeed 'Homer anachronizes.'

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, U.S.A.

HORATIANA.

IN the following passages of Horace the difficulty of the text is obvious and notorious. Even the most conservative editors admit it, and elaborate discussion of it here would be superfluous. I shall therefore make no more comment than is sufficient to raise the point of objection to the received text.

1. *Sat. I. 1. 108 sqq.*:

illuc unde abii redeo †qui nemo ut avarus
se probet ac potius laudet diversa sequentis, etc.

Read 108 *qui nemo aut rarus*.

All the MSS. have *ut avarus*, but there is fumbling with the preceding words. The oldest Blandinian, V, alone had *qui nemo*: the others vary between *nemone ut*, *ne non ut*, *nemo ut*. Editors therefore have fixed their attention here, and there is not a single recorded emendation of *ut avarus*. But the real difficulty of the passage lies in these words. For the natural meaning of the text is 'Why nobody else is content, as the *avarus* is,' and so Porphyry took it: *ab aliis dissentire tamen avarum ait qui proposito suo gaudet solus*. Yet the whole satire has been devoted to showing that the prevalent discontent is due to *avaritia*. Many editors therefore analyse *nemo* into *quisque non* and take *ut avarus* as *utpote avarus*, ὡς φιλάργυρος ὢν, thus making Horace put his answer as part of his question. The reading *aut rarus* removes all difficulty in the sense. It is good Latin. For *aut* cf. *Epp. I. 15. 33, 34 nil | aut paullum*

abstulerat. For *rarus* cf. Quint. XII. Proem. 3.: *rarus, qui tam procul a portu recessisset, reperiebatur*. It will be conceded that *aut rarus* is not far removed either in pronunciation or spelling from *ut avarus* and that the mistake might easily have arisen accidentally. But there is one reason why it might have been made deliberately, viz. that spondaic hexameters are rare in Horace. There are four or five in the lyrics (with Greek proper names), but only one in *Satt.* and *Epp.*, viz. *A. P. 467 invitum qui servat idem facit occidenti*. But if Horace wrote this, he could write more. Similarly, there is only one certain instance in the hexameters of a hypermetrical syllable elided (*Sat. I. 4. 96 usus amicoque*), but editors are quite willing to imitate this at *Sat. I. 6. 102 (rusve peregreve)* and some even at *Sat. II. 1. 54 (nimirum)*.

2. *A. P. 119-122*:

aut famam sequere aut sibi convenientia finge
scriptor †honoratum si forte reponis Achillem,
impiger iracundus inexorabilis acer
iura neget sibi nata, nihil non arroget armis.

Read 120 *scriptor an orator*.

Some edd. put a full stop at *finge*, some at *scriptor*. In either case, *scriptor* has an emphasis which is not easily explained. Moreover, *honoratum*, whether it be an epithet or predicative, is an extraordinary word to use in connexion with Achilles, whose character is known only from the poem which describes his

dishonour. Bentley's suggestion *Homereum* or *Homeriacum* is both remote from the letters and otiose, for there is no other Achilles than the Homeric. Editors of course do the best they can for the text, but it is a bad best, and the passage wants emendation. Now l. 122, *iura neget*, etc., evidently contemplates Achilles as declaiming, and I suggest that Horace had in mind that sort of *suasoria* which Quintilian (III. 8. 49) calls a *prosopopoeia* and on which he gives much the same cautions as Horace does. *Præcipue declamatoribus considerandum est*, he says (ib. 51) *quid cuique personae conveniat*, and a little lower (53) he mentions that themes were often taken from the poets, and gives as an example *Priami verba apud Achillem*. My reading, *scriptor an orator*, would mean 'whether you are writing a play or composing a declamation.' It not only removes the foolish *honoratum*, but relieves the undue emphasis on *scriptor*. For the phrase, cf. Ovid. *Fasti* IV. 7 *Saucius an sanus, numquid tua signa reliqui?* It seems to me likely that, of the two Piso boys for whom Horace was writing, the younger was studying rhetoric, while the elder (*A. P.* 366) was certainly studying poetry.

3. *Carm.* I. xx. 9, 10:

Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno
tu †bibes uvam.

Read *tu iubes*.

The difficulty here is caused by the context; for though *tu bibes* by itself might be a 'permissive' future, it cannot be so within a few lines of *vile potabis*, etc. Writing in this review in 1912 (*Vol.* XXVI. p. 51), I said that I had many years ago proposed the emendation *iubes* (since published by Mr. Traube), but had suppressed it, at the request of the editor, for want of an illustration of this use of *iubere*, viz. 'to order a thing' from a servant, 'to order up' from the kitchen, etc. I have since found one, and, as usual, not far off. In *Epp.* II. 2. 61-64 Horace says—

tres mihi convivæ prope dissentire videntur,
poscentes vario multum diversa palato.
quid dem? quid non dem? renuis tu quod iubet
alter:
quod petis, id sane est invisum acidumque
duobus.

Here is a dinner-party, and *iubere* used of an order to the waiter.

4. Finally, I will venture to notice two passages in which I believe that Horace ought to be emended by ἀπαξ λεγόμενα. These, of course, must await approval till a copy of Horace is unearthed from the ruins of Herculaneum, but in the meantime they are at least plausible enough to be amusing.

(a) *Carm.* II. xx. 5-7:

non ego pauperum
sanguis parentum, non ego quem †vocas
dilecte Maecenas.

I suggest *iocas* for *vocas*. It is evident that *non ego quem vocas* conceals something depreciatory, something in striking contrast with the fame that Horace is to win by his poetry. The middle form *iocari* seems to me to imply an active transitive form *iocare*, meaning 'to make fun of,' 'to banter'; and, in fact, Horace, as Suetonius tells us, was bantered at least by Augustus, '*inter alios iocos*,' on his little tubby figure.

(b) *Carm.* III. xxiv. 3, 4:

caementis licet occupes
Tyrrenum omne tuis et mare †ponticum.

In this well-known passage the MSS. vary between *publicum*, *Apulicum* and *ponticum*, but it is the best and oldest MSS. (Keller's AB with αλλ) that have *ponticum*. I suggest that Horace really wrote *et Metaponticum*, meaning the gulf of Tarentum. This would naturally be the next sea, after the Tyrrhene, to be invaded by the builder. The emendation occurred to me (as it did also to my friend Mr. John Sargeant) on seeing, in the Italian railway tables, that Metaponto is the next station to Taranto. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the gulf was ever called after Metapontum and the proper adjective form *Metapontum* in *Metapontinus* with long *i*. Yet some laxity might have been allowable; for the adjective of *Pontus* is certainly *Ponticus*, and the adjective of *Hellespontus*, usually *Hellespontiacus*, is sometimes *Hellespontius* or *Hellesponticus*. *Ligustinus* and *Ligusticus* are equally common, and Pliny, who uses *Ligustini* of the people (10. § 73), uses *Ligusticum* of the sea (3. § 75).

J. Gow.

NOTES

PINDAR, *PYTH.* II. 90 FF.

στάθμας δέ τινος ἐλκόμενοι
περισσᾶς ἐνέπαξαν ἔλκ-
ος ὀδυναρὸν ἐὰν πρόσθε καρδία.

IN the last number of the *Classical Quarterly* Professor G. Norwood discusses this passage. His conclusion is that στάθμας is incapable of explanation and therefore corrupt; and he proposes to replace it by σπάθας, with the sense 'They tug at their sword, too unwieldy for their grasp, and smite their own heart with a grievous wound.' But is not this merely to replace Gildersleeve's 'suicidal gymnastics' with an equally futile performance? Why should the sword 'leave the scabbard with an upward jerk' any more than a downward jerk? And supposing it did, would it not be as likely to slit the bungler's nose as to wound 'his chest'—or wherever he kept his καρδία? Moreover, what pertinence have swords and scabbards in this connection? I am afraid σπάθη is no improvement on στάθμη, if only we can make sense of στάθμη. Dr. Fennell's explanation is bad enough, but, as Professor Norwood admits, 'it has the merit of supposing the same metaphor as that in the following lines (φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς ἐπαυχένιον λαβόντα ζυγὸν ἀρήγει κτέ)'—a merit which the σπάθη theory lacks. Can we keep up continuity of metaphor, while improving on Fennell? Suppose the general idea to be that of horses (or 'fillies' if you like) pulling at a cart or plough: then we are told that they hurt themselves, somehow or other, because they pull at a στάθμας περισσᾶς—'too big a στάθμη.' What, then, is a στάθμη? 'In Pindar,' says Professor J. B. Bury, 'στάθμη always mean a rule, measure or norm'—to which dictum I would merely add the postscript, 'except where it means something else.' And something else, by all the rules of common sense, it does mean here, in *Pyth.* ii. 90.

The problem before us is, what relevant sense can στάθμη bear when used in connection with ζυγόν? In

considering this we may notice first how ζυγόν itself is a word of double meaning—(1) the cross-bar of a yoke, and (2) the beam of a balance—and how the ζυγόν, with its dangling straps or collars (ζεῦγλαι, λέπαδνα) at each end looks very much like the ζυγόν with dangling scales (τάλαντα, πλάστιγγες). Hence it is not surprising to find some of the yoke-terms exchanged with balance-terms, as when Eur. *Rhes.* 303 uses πλάστιγγξ for a 'horse-collar.' Further, we have the phrase ἔλκειν σταθμόν, 'to draw down the balance,' which shows how σταθμός may be connected with the balance-ζυγόν; σταθμός is, presumably, the post or upright on which the ζυγόν is fastened. What corresponds to this in the case of the yoke-ζυγόν is the ῥυμός or chariot-pole to which the yoke is attached. This horizontal pole might equally well be called στάθμη. It is true that there is no direct evidence for this use elsewhere in Greek, but a similar use of the corresponding Latin word *statera* is found in Statius, *Silv.* iv. 3, 35, 'dum pondus nimium querens sub alta | repit languida quadrupes *statera*.' Professor Norwood may still object that 'some kind of stab is needed to give appropriateness to the words ἐνέπαξαν and καρδία'; but surely we cannot arm our 'fillies' with swords or lancers, and a galling collar may quite well produce a sore chest—ἔλκος πρόσθε καρδία. If we can extract reasonable sense from the text, together with consistency of metaphor, 'let us be therewith content.'

R. G. BURY.

NOTE ON PLATO, *REPUBLIC*, VII. 514B.

ὥσπερ τοῖς θαυματοποιοῖς πρὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρόκειται τὰ παραφράγματα ὑπὲρ ὧν τὰ θαύματα δεικνύασιν.

In this passage commentators and translators appear to construe τοῖς θαυματοποιοῖς as a dative of agency or of general reference. They feel that it requires some accommodation with the

following words, *πρὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. Some take the latter to be the spectators; others the performers—and this is surely right. Jowett and Campbell distinguish the *ἄνθρωποι* as the actual exhibitors from the *θαυματοποιοί* the masters of the show. Adam thinks they are the same persons, and says that 'Plato might, if he had been so minded, have written ὥσπερ τοῖς θαυματοποιοῖς πρὸ ἐαυτῶν κ.τ.λ.'

All difficulty will vanish if we translate τοῖς θαυματοποιοῖς 'At the marionettes,' and class it with *καινοῖς τραγωδοῖς* (*Pseph. ap. Dem.* 18. 116). The substitution of performers for performance is natural enough, as we say 'At the Old Masters,' meaning at the exhibition of their pictures. Such a phrase as *κωμῳδῶν ὄντων ἐν Κολυττῷ* (*Aeschin.* 22. 27) is a halfway point. As for the dative case, Kühner-Gerth (II. i. p. 445) class *καινοῖς τραγωδοῖς*, *Παναθηναίοις*, etc., with datives denoting 'die Zeit, und zwar in der Regel den bestimmten Zeitpunkt (das Datum),' and add 'Zur Datierung dienen auch die regelmässige wiederkehrenden Staatsfeste.' But τοῖς *μυστηρίοις*, τοῖς *ἐπινικίοις* lead the way to something rather less definite. Cicero's *gladiatoribus* (*Phil.* 1. 36, and *Att.* 2. 19) means 'at the gladiatorial show,' not merely 'on the day of the gladiatorial show'; and it does not seem impossible that this variety of the locative dative in Greek should be used to denote not a date but an occasion, and not necessarily an occasion of regular recurrence. Even with the names of regularly recurring festivals the dative means, in some contexts, rather at than on the date of.

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

ON THE TEXT OF PLATO, REPUBLIC IV. 442 A.

μὴ τῷ πῖμπλασθαι τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα καλουμένων ἡδονῶν πολὺ καὶ ἰσχυρὸν γενόμενον οὐκ αὖ τὰ ἐαυτοῦ πράττει, ἀλλὰ καταδουλώσασθαι καὶ ἄρχειν ἐπιχειρήσῃ ὧν οὐ προσήκον αὐτῷ γένει (*sic codd. optimi*; *γενῶν uel γένῃ dett. aliquot*).

THE CRUX of the passage is the word *γένει*, of which no convincing explana-

tion has been given, see commentators *ad loc.* The variant *γενῶν* is so poorly supported as to appear either a blunder or an attempt at emendation. I believe the difficulty to have arisen from the mistaken idea that *γένει* is *dat. sing.* The passage abounds in duals, Sokrates affirming and reaffirming the idea that the rational and 'spirited' elements of the soul normally form a pair. *γένει* seems to me to be *acc. dual*, and ὧν a corruption for ὧ. The *acc.* is governed, *διὰ μέσου*, by *καταδουλώσασθαι*, cf. Riddell, *Digest of Platonic Idioms*, 273. It is curious, if this be right, that one inferior manuscript has the more correct Attic form of the dual, *γένῃ* (see Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 142); but this probably is a mere miswriting.

H. J. ROSE.

McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

A NOTE ON THE MEANING OF EXILIS VIA (*Tristia* I. II. 86).

exilem facio per mea vota viam.

If we accept the popular derivation (*ex* and *ilia*), the root meaning of *exilis* will be much the same as 'anaemic' in English. We find it applied in Cicero to both *cor* and *iecur*, and in much the same sense possibly in Ovid *M.* vi. 143, 'in latere exiles digiti pro cruribus haerent.' Then in a more extended, figurative sense we find *exilis* applied to *oratio*, as in colloquial English we often use 'anaemic' to describe a feeble, undervitalised effect.

Now, what does Ovid mean by describing the journey to the scene of his exile as *via exilis*? Possibly we may find the clue to his meaning in the famous passage in Horace's *C.* I. 4. 17, *Exilis domus Plutonia*, with which we may compare 'the vasty hall of Death' in Matthew Arnold, 'To-night she doth inherit the vasty hall of Death.' Horace *Ep.* I. 6. 45, defines *exilis domus* as 'exilis domus est, ubi non et multa supersunt,' 'a comfortless, cheerless house,' as opposed to *plena domus* (*C.* II., 12. 24).

Now, if the cold grave itself may be fitly described as *exilis*, might not the journey to the grave be aptly pictured as

exilis via? Ovid again and again in his *Tristia* refers to his exile as a living death. Thus the translation would be, 'it is a sorry, cheerless journey I am playing for.' Possibly this is the meaning also in Senec. *N. Q.* 1. 1 'ignes tenuissimi iter exile designant.'

It seems hardly possible with Lewis and Short to understand *exilis via* as 'a rapid passage' to one's destination, the opposite of *via longa*.

The only two passages, so far as I am aware, quoted in support of the meaning 'short' are *iter exile* in Seneca and *digiti exiles* in Ovid, both of which, I consider, are open to a different interpretation.

ROBERT F. CROOK.

16, Trinity College, Dublin.

NOTES ON CICERO.

Ad Atticum, xiii. 37. 2 :

Nihil novi sane nisi . . . omnibus eum (Quintum filium) locis furere maximeque in conviviis *cum multa de me*, tum redire ad patrem, etc.

THE underlined words are strange, and *cum* and *tum* make the sentence rather flat. The ellipse of *dicere* is harsh here: a verb is wanted to balance *redire*. Possibly *commulcare me* 'belabours me.' In *Att.* i. 14. 5 the readings of Z and M *commultium*, *commulcium* or *commulticium* for the vulg. *convicium* point to the word *commulcium*, 'a trouncing,' as the right reading, the trouncing being, as here, one of words. This correction *commulcium* is due to O. E. Schmidt. Lambinus on Plaut. *Merc.* 59 recognised the word, but interpreted it as 'a bruise,' or 'a weal.' I now think Schmidt's reading is right, and that *convicium* could not have led to the corruptions. If it is right, it would go far to support *commulcare* here.

Ib. xv. 29. 2 :

Quintus filius usque Puteolos—mirus civis ut tu *Favonius Asinium* dicas—etc.

Young Quintus had just become a violent anti-Caesarian, so there is no place for *Asinium*; besides, it seems most likely that only one personality is mentioned. Possibly the manuscript reading is a corruption of a comic superlative,

Favoniissimum or *Favonianissimum*, 'a super-Favonius' or 'super-Favonian.' For a comic comparative of a proper name, cp. Plaut. *Poen.* 991, *nullus me est hodie Poenus Poenior*: and for comic superlatives, cp. *ipsisissimus* (Plaut. *Trin.* 988), *geminissimus* (*Persa*, 830), *patruemi patruissime* (*Poen.* 1197), *oculissimus* (*Curc.* 15, 121). Cicero elsewhere, when in pleasant mood, invents a facetious grammatical form (*Att.* i. 16. 13), *Quare, ut opinor, φιλοσοφητέον . . . et istos consulatus non flocci faciteon*. The comic superlative would suit the contemptuous irony of Cicero, also shown by *mirus*, 'marvellous,' applied to a man. He had not much faith in the sincerity of his nephew's conversion.

L. C. PURSER.

Trinity College, Dublin.

NOTE ON VARR. *L.L.* 5 § 173, MÜLL.

(As given s.v. *Sestertius* in *L.* and *S.*)

IF the *quartus* be altered to read *quintus* (a very likely and reasonable emendation involving only *quin* instead of *quar* in minuscule), then we get the following sense:

'The word *sestertius* is from the fact that it is the sum of two and one-half (for the dupondius or two-as piece plus a half is the old *sestertius*), and from the ancient custom of speaking of money in an upside-down manner, and so of calling the fifth-half the *third-half*, called *sestertius* from *semis tertius*.'

This very Varronian explanation may be then amplified thus:

The word *sestertius* = *semis tertius*, that is the *third-half*. We should, however, expect it to be called the *fifth-half*, since it is made of $2^{as} + \frac{1}{2}^{as}$, in its actual value. The blunder is explained by the love of contrariety which made our forefathers speak of the *fifth-half* as the *third-half*.

The explanation, however, seems needlessly ingenious. For surely $2\frac{1}{2}$ has reached the *third-half*, in any literal statement of Roman fractions up to $2\frac{1}{2}$.

$\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{4}{5}, 1;$
 $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{4}{5}, 2; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{2}.$

F. W. G. FOAT.

REVIEWS

ZEUS: A STUDY IN ANCIENT RELIGION.

Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion. By ARTHUR BERNARD COOK. Vol. I. Cambridge University Press. £2 2s.

THE first instalment of Mr. Cook's great work will fully reward the expectations of scholars. They will find in it a very exhaustive collection of matter, treated with the boldness and ingenuity which they associate with the writer, and though they will probably find themselves differing often, sometimes differing violently, from Mr. Cook's conclusions, they will be able to get the materials for their arguments from the book itself, and to thank the author for many happy suggestions. The Cambridge Press also has done its part well; the illustrations are very numerous and good, though some of the plates would have been easier to use if they had been less deeply embedded in the volume—in other words, if the volume had been divided into two.

A great part of the present work is not about Zeus, but it is none the worse for that. Zeus is described at the outset as the god of the Bright Sky; but it is argued that the original object of worship in pre-Hellenic times was the Bright Sky itself, and (I think unsuccessfully) that traces of this cult survived in popular belief into Hellenic times. There follows a very valuable discussion of the mountain-cults of the god, who as the god of the Sky had his seat on the tops of the highest mountains; the first discussed are those of Zeus Lykaïos (regarded by Mr. Cook as the god of Light, not primarily the Wolf-god) and Zeus Olympios. (Homeric scholars will note the author's view that Olympus in Homer is always the actual mountain.) The development of the mountain-cults, and of the conception of the mountain as the birth-place, the throne and the burial-place of Zeus, is next explained and illustrated, and the disappearance of them in the Christian era before the cult of Elias, just as

other Hellenic deities became half-Christianised. Mr. Cook's account of these processes is full of interest. The author then passes on to the relation of the Sky-god to the great lights in the sky, and the greater part of the present volume is concerned with the solar cults, many of which are described and discussed very minutely, with a brief paragraph here and there, either to indicate that they had no original relation to that of Zeus, or to show how they came to be connected with that of Zeus by a conscious or unconscious syncretism. Mr. Cook maintains that although in course of time 'Zeus was brought into close connection with any and every celestial luminary,' yet 'genuine Hellenic religion never identified Zeus with sun or moon or star'; and most of the volume is an amplification of this text. The discussion takes the reader very far afield. For a hundred pages or more he will find himself dealing with solar wheels and disks, and with all the mythological personages who were connected with wheels; then with the 'Lycian symbol' and the *triskeles*, and with Cyclopes and other monsters, who are supposed by Mr. Cook to be anthropomorphised versions of such solar symbols; and afterwards with a great variety of Ram- and Bull-cults, and their relation to that of Zeus, who was sometimes a Ram-god, sometimes a Bull-god, but is not thereby proved to have been a solar god, since the Ram and the Bull were symbols of the fertilising virtue of the sky no less than of the sun. Further, we have a somewhat lengthy treatment of Dionysiac cults, which are brought in on the strength of the hypothesis that Dionysus (whether in his Cretan form, Zagreus, or in Thracian cults) is but Zeus re-born; and, among them, of Tragedy, Comedy, and Satyric Drama. The notion of the Bull-god leads to a long discussion of Egyptian rites, and of the Cretan bull-legends; incidentally some fifty pages are devoted to the

Labyrinth of Minos, to the bull-fights and dances of Knossos and other places, and the meaning of ritual horns; and nearly one hundred pages to some important Syrian cults, blended in late times with those of Zeus.

This enumeration of subjects—and it is very far from complete—is sufficient to show that it is impossible to give any adequate criticism of the book in a review; and I shrink from making generalisations, which it would not be possible here to support by evidence. But the impression which remains most strongly in my mind is that of the need of something like a Grammar or Logic of *Religionswissenschaft*. I find myself perpetually asking for a critical account of the different kinds of evidence employed, and of the proper use of them; and in almost every place where I venture to differ from Mr. Cook (and such places are inevitably many in the course of eight hundred pages), I find that the difference can be resolved into a problem about the right use of certain kinds of evidence. It would, of course, be ridiculous to expect that arguments in works on this subject should observe strictly the canons of Formal Logic; but we do require that some limit should be imposed upon the range of deviation from strict proof; and I feel from time to time that Mr. Cook, though far more conscious than many anthropologists of the weakness even of some of the arguments which evidently attract him most, is carried by his enthusiasm and his imagination beyond the legitimate limits; and he is so delightful a companion in these ventures, that there is a risk of others being carried with him, and the whole study of Ancient Religion being transplanted on to insecure foundations. I will give a few illustrations.

1. *The Use of Scientific or of Late Writers as Evidence of Early Popular Beliefs.*—I doubt if Mr. Cook's use of Xenophanes (p. 11), Heracleitus (p. 28), and Empedocles (p. 31) to support his theory that the worship of the sky itself left traces among the Hellenes is really justifiable. There is really nothing to show that the materialism of Xenophanes and his protest against the prevalent anthropomorphic religion was

suggested by any lingering attraction towards such primitive cults, when εἰς τὸν ὅλον οὐρανὸν ἀποβλέψας τὸ ἐν εἶναι φησι τὸν θεόν; and the statement that 'Xenophanes, like Pythagoras and many another reformer, starts with a revival of half-forgotten beliefs,' seems, like the similar statement about Heracleitos on p. 30, to be a *petitio principii*. (The case of Pythagoras is somewhat different.) To treat Heracleitos as evidence of popular belief is almost a paradox; it is very hard to believe that 'Heracleitos' cardinal doctrine of the universe as an Ever-living Fire is but a refinement upon the primitive conception of Zeus the Burning-Sky'; and the fragment quoted, ἄντιον τῆς ἄρκτου οὐροῦ αἰθρίον Διός, certainly does not imply that Zeus is thought of as the Bright Sky itself, rather than as the Lord of the Bright Sky. 'My neighbour's boundary' means the boundary of his land, but does not identify him with his garden. Nor can I think that Empedocles 'availed himself of the belief that the fiery sky is Zeus'; and I am very doubtful whether the Ἄηρ which Empedocles called Zeus was 'the fiery sky' at all, and not rather 'air.' I find the same difficulty in Mr. Cook's treatment of Ennius (p. 10). Ennius wrote, 'Aspice hoc sublime candens, quem invocant omnes Iovem'; but surely the explanation is not that the Italians were just at this moment passing from the cult of the sky to that of the Sky-god; but that Ennius was a follower of Euhemerus, or perhaps, in this passage, of Euripides (fr. 941): ὁρᾷς τὸν ὑψοῦ τόνδ' ἄπειρον αἰθέρα; | τοῦτον νομίζε Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ θεόν; and what Ennius represents is Greek rationalism—the very opposite of popular belief. It seems indeed that to use literature which was certainly not popular as evidence of popular belief is only legitimate if the writer quoted states that popular or primitive belief is described. Late literature generally needs the most careful handling, and above all the literature of times which were dominated by syncretistic tendencies. I cannot (e.g.) but look with great suspicion on the evidence from a Nestorian commentary on the *Acts* produced by Dr. Rendel Harris and several times quoted by Mr. Cook, for regarding the Cretan

Zeus as an Adonis-like personage killed by a wild boar, and annually revived—a conception of the god which does not fit in well with other accounts of Cretan ideas about Zeus. The only explicit evidence for the belief in Zagreus as not merely the son of Zeus but *Zeus re-born* is to be found in Nonnos. A good many points in Mr. Cook's argument turn on this passage, and they hardly seem sufficient to bear the weight of so much conjecture with regard to centuries so much earlier. Even writers like Apollodorus and Strabo, and conscious systematisers generally, are not to be used without caution as evidence of actual beliefs at any given period; but I have not space to illustrate this point, which is, after all, obvious.

2. *The Use of Works of Art as Evidence of Cult or Belief*.—Mr. Cook is very often both brilliant and convincing in this part of his work; but now and then questions suggest themselves. Does (*e.g.*) the use of symbols in representations of the god imply that the god was once identical with the symbol? If it does not do so universally, when does it do so? Do the blue nimbus and blue globe connected with representations of Zeus really imply that he *was* once the Sky itself in popular belief? Could they not be attached to him as *god of the sky*? Or again, is every group of dancing creatures (satyrs or what-not) on a vase, with a flute player in their midst, to be taken to represent an actual cult-dance? or is it possible that, given the idea of satyrs, painters exercised their imagination and drew little scenes of this sort without direct dependence on ritual? The interpretation of the Pandora-krater and many other vases cannot be regarded as satisfactory until this question is answered one way or another. I do not feel sure that Mr. Cook is right in treating this as a representation of a satyric-play, though of course it illustrates the fifth-century notion of the satyr.

3. *The Use of Metaphors as Evidence*.—I cannot believe that the poetical descriptions of the sun and moon as the eyes of Zeus show that 'the Greeks . . . at one time regarded the sun and moon as the eyes of the animate sky' (p. 196), any more than the modern

Peloponnesian Greeks whom Mr. Cook quotes.¹

4. *The Use of Modern Folk-Plays as Evidence*.—Without going into details, I feel that we greatly need some principles here. At least it should be necessary to establish continuity in time between the ancient and the modern rite or performance, and, if the modern is used as evidence of the ancient Greek custom, to exclude the possibility of foreign influence.

5. *The Use of Analogy*.—Analogy is of course the principal weapon of the anthropologist; but it would be a great advantage if some principles with regard to its use were agreed upon. Mr. Cook sets an excellent example in his Preface, when he lays down 'that analogies taken from a contiguous area are more likely to be helpful than analogies gathered, sometimes on doubtful authority, from the ends of the habitable earth'; and of the former class of analogies he makes a very fruitful use. But now and then he seems to go beyond legitimate analogy. I very much doubt (*e.g.*) whether he proves that the wheel of Fortune is a solar-wheel (p. 268), and that it was a cult-utensil before it was a divine attribute. The use of the wheel as the symbol, not of the sun, but of instability, is attested by Pacuvius (*ap. Rhet. ad Herenn.* 2, 23, 36), who is probably working upon Greek material; and perhaps by Sophocles (fr. 787); and the rarity of the wheel on monuments perhaps suggests that it originated in poetry rather than in cult. Again, it seems hazardous to connect the Hekatoncheires and Cheirogastores with the solar symbol, the *triskeles*, on the ground that the many hands of the former are analogous to the three legs of the latter, even if there are some other slight grounds for the connection (p. 314). The analogy sometimes depends on the principle that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another (cf. an argument on p. 247 and another on pp. 319, 320); and this principle rarely holds true in anthropology so far as it is

¹ One of the strangest of Mr. Cook's identifications—that of the *Kyklops*' eye with the sun—is partly based on the assertion here criticised.

the record of beliefs as they were when living, rather than of identifications of cults by systematisers or in syncretistic worships; for to a systematiser at least a cult is often virtually a dead specimen, and syncretism has much of the systematiser in its heart. Sometimes the analogy resolves itself simply into an argument with an 'undistributed middle-term'—e.g., on p. 254, the Lynx-wheel had four spokes; the wheel of Ixion had four spokes; therefore the Lynx wheel = the wheel of Ixion, and therefore = the Sun. The argument which supports the identification of Zeus and Argos on the ground that both are called Πανόπτης is of the same class, but more risky, since the ground of the epithet was different in the two cases. It will doubtless be objected, in answer to my request for a Logic of the subject, that on my principles so little could be taken as proved, and a great part of the work of some writers on Ancient Religion would be undone. "Ἀνθρώπων", ἀφαιρήσει με τὴν τραγῳδίαν. This, I think, is true; and work which is based on conjectures, supported by other conjectures, and not on more or less clear principles of proof, had better be undone. But this, of course, does not apply to more than a fraction of Mr. Cook's work.

Apart from these difficulties as to method, a few special points in this volume call for some remark.

The treatment of the Kyklops legend leads to some strange results. The monster's one eye is identified with the shining orb of the sun, and the Kyklops is regarded as originally a Sky-god like Zeus; various legends are compared to prove his close connection with Zeus, and it is argued that the Kyklops was not only the maker, but originally the wielder and owner of the thunderbolt. The last point is certainly not proved by the monuments adduced (p. 319); and most of the arguments in which the Kyklops figures are somewhat unconvincing. The legend of the boring out of the Kyklops' eye is treated as parallel to the version of the Prometheus story which makes him get fire by applying a torch or reed to the wheel of the sun (though the story of Odysseus's exploit contains not the least hint of a desire to carry fire away); and both legends are

explained as originating in a tale about the discovery of fire-sticks. This is at least very ingenious; but our suspicions are provoked by the linguistic arguments which follow, in which Prometheus, who is said by Hesychius to have been called also Ithas or Ithax, is treated on that ground as closely parallel to Odysseus Ithakesios or Ithakos, while the name is also connected with αἶθω, αἰθήρ, and the god of the Burning Sky. I have also great doubts about the inference drawn from the title Promantheus, applied to Zeus at Thurii. (The reader will find many new and remarkable derivations in this book.)

Mr. Cook revives Overbeck's theory that the worship of Zeus Ammon in the Oasis was established in the course of an early Greek expedition to Libya; he does not of course use certain arguments of Overbeck's which have long been discredited, but makes out a very strong case, comparing closely the oracular worships of the Oasis and of Dodona.

It will be interesting to know what Sir Arthur Evans thinks of Mr. Cook's treatment of the Labyrinth and of Cretan matters generally; the argument ranges far, and whether conclusive or not, throws no little light on the subject. The Labyrinth is regarded by Mr. Cook as a theatral area, marked out for an annual dance by the Minotaur (in other words by the Crown Prince of Knossos in ritual costume, with a bull's head), representing the revolutions of the sun, conceived as a bull: the object of the dance was to promote the year's fruitfulness, by presenting the sun in his strength fulfilling his course and fertilising the earth. Whether Mr. Cook's explanation of the practice (so often depicted on early artistic remains) of taking the bull by the horns is correct, may perhaps be doubted. It is at least as likely that it was an effective trick in fighting (if employed with discretion), as that its object was to secure for the fighter the strength embodied in the horns. But, once more, we need a grammar of symbolism.

The subject, perhaps, of most general interest with which Mr. Cook incidentally deals is that of the Greek Drama.

Here he reverses the ordinary account, according to which Tragedy was particularly associated with the City Dionysia and Comedy with the Lenaea—an account which certainly seems to be true of the fifth century, in which the Tragedy of the Lenaea was comparatively unimportant; and if the opposite was originally the case, we want to know what was the reason for the change. The fact that State-recognised competitions were organised for Comedy later than for Tragedy at the Dionysia also tells against the new theory. (Aristotle *Poet.* V. ὅψε ποτε ὁ ἄρχων ἔδωκεν naturally refers to the ἐπώνυμος, and not to the βασιλείς who managed the Lenaea, and the very probable reconstruction of the great Dionysiac inscription [*C.I.A.* II. 971] by Capps and Wilhelm confirms the old view.) The Lenaea was doubtless the more primitive festival, but this does not prove that it was the festival at which Tragedy originated; and if Mr. Cook makes out a strong case for the theory that the Lenaeae ritual included the representation of the Anodos of the Earth-mother with the infant Iacchus, and that (though this is much more doubtful) it also included a passion-play representing the passion of Dionysus, he is still far from proving that it was this ritual and not some other, at first rustic but afterwards brought into the City Dionysia, which gave rise to Tragedy. As a matter of fact, the Schol. on Clement of Alexandria, whose remark (containing at least one mistake, the association of ληναίξειν with the λῆνος) is the only positive evidence for Mr. Cook's belief in a passion-play at the Lenaea, does not really prove more than that the verb ληναίξειν was associated with a rustic song, 'including' (an ambiguous word, περιεῖχεν, which may mean simply 'telling of') the σπαραγμός of Dionysus; and if λῆναι was a current name for Maenads, the song is not even, without further evidence, to be particularly associated with the Lenaea.

Mr. Cook argues that his view that Tragedy originated at the Lenaea, Comedy at the City Dionysia, is confirmed by the order in which the performances at the two festivals are mentioned in the Law of Euegoras

(Dem. in Meid. § 10) and in inscriptions—Tragedy before Comedy at the Lenaea, Comedy before Tragedy at the City Dionysia. He assumes (1) that the order of enumeration is the order of performance, and not of importance at the two festivals; (2) that the more primitive part of the festival was necessarily performed first. Both assumptions are very doubtful. As to (1), the fact that the order of enumeration is different for the two festivals can be just as well explained by supposing that the order of importance was different—Tragedy being originally connected with the one festival, Comedy with the other—as by supposing that the order of performance was different; and he has to alter the text of Aristoph. *Av.* 787, in order to bring it into line with his view. Many scholars hold that Tragedy and Comedy were performed on the same day, as Aristophanes (unemended) implies—three Tragedies, a Satyric Play, and a Comedy on each day. If that were so, the order of enumeration in Laws and Inscriptions would, of course, not take the alternation into account, but would naturally follow the order of importance, as generally accepted at the time. I suspect (though no proof is possible as regards the first two days) that the performances from Elaphebolion 10-14 were—on the 10th, Boys' Choruses and one Comedy; 11th, Men's Choruses and one Comedy; 12th, 13th, 14th, 3 Tragedies, Satyric Play, and one Comedy. The other assumption (2) seems to be quite arbitrary, and without it Mr. Cook's argument fails. Accretions might obviously either precede or follow the original performance.

Mr. Cook believes that the dithyramb with which the City Dionysia opened represented the begetting of Dionysus (in accordance with his derivation of the word from the root -θόρ-), and preceded the celebration of his birth at the Lenaea, quite properly, by ten lunar months, and supposes that, in Plato's statement that the subject of the dithyramb was the γένεσις of the god, γένεσις includes γέννησις. It may be doubted whether he does not restrict the original theme of the dithyramb too closely; and his next paragraph only

proves that phallic ritual was performed at the City Dionysia, not that Comedy originated from this particular phallic ritual. It may well have come to be attached to such ritual; but I believe that the evidence of Dorian *origin* is too strong to be explained away. The suggestion on p. 733 that the wedding of Zeus and Semele (and the begetting of Dionysus) were represented at the Pandia, with which the Dionysia terminated, is very inadequately proved.

Mr. Cook then proceeds to argue that, like the City Dionysia and the Lenaea, the Anthesteria and the Rural Dionysia respectively centred upon the begetting and the birth of Dionysus, with a ten months' interval between them. The arguments are wonderfully ingenious, but very hazardous. Among the chief difficulties are his (to me) very improbable interpretation of the picture of the Rural Dionysia given in the *Acharnians*, and the apparent fact that the ten months' interval was not constant. Dr. Farnell (*Cults*, V. 206) gives some reason for thinking that (*e.g.*) at Icaria the Rural Dionysia took place in the spring; and the date of the festival certainly varied in different places (*cf.* Haigh, *Attic Theatre*, ed. 3, p. 29).

Further, Mr. Cook suggests that if the Lenaeon drama was the true parent of Attic Tragedy, it was presumably followed by a satyric display. He adds in a note that 'this is not definitely recorded, but our records are very incomplete.' But the inscriptional record of Lenaeon Tragedies for the years 420/19, 419/8 (*C.I.A.* II. 972), though mutilated, shows quite clearly that in those years at any rate there was no

satyric play attached to the tragedies represented by the two competing poets; for the inscription allows no room for the mention of anything more than the tragedies. What little evidence there is is thus distinctly against the suggestion made.

Mr. Cook's suggestion that satyr-dances may not have been originally Dionysiac, but may have attached themselves to the cult of any fertility power, and to Dionysus among others, is very attractive, because it avoids the derivation of Tragedy directly from satyric play—a derivation made very difficult by the immense difference in tone between the two. I do not gather whether he thinks that the chorus of Thespis were dressed as *τράγοι*: I doubt whether they were; but certainly no authority ascribes satyr-plays or a satyr-chorus to Thespis.

I have ventured to criticise a good many of Mr. Cook's arguments, from no love of controversy, which I detest, but solely because I think that he has not yet found the solution of some of the difficulties which must be got over before we can be at all sure that we are near the truth about the Greek Drama. At present, I frankly do not believe that the evidence is sufficient to enable us to decide many of the questions we should like to ask; but that is no reason for accepting any answers that are not sufficiently grounded. I should like to conclude, as I began, with an expression of sincere gratitude to Mr. Cook for his exhaustive and illuminating treatise.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

CARTHAGINIAN IMPERIALISM.

Geschichte der Karthager. Von OTTO MELTZER. Dritter Band. Von 218-146. Von ULRICH KAHRSTEDT. I vol. Pp. xi+690. 2 maps. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 20.

THE final volume of Meltzer's *History of the Carthaginians* (Vol. I. 1879; Vol. II.

1896), has at last appeared. Meltzer was an old-fashioned historian even in his generation: his method was to collect conscientiously and completely all the literary material for his subject—a task always formidable in ancient history, and especially in the history of Carthage—and then to combine his gleanings in the most imposing way he

could. His entire lack of critical power almost deprives his picture of value. It is therefore satisfactory to find that Kahrstedt, Meltzer's continuator, has not been content to supplement Meltzer's work on Meltzer's own lines, but has produced an independent study on the last phase of Carthaginian history.

The first 140 pages survey the Carthaginian Empire in 218; but they really do more; they sketch the archaeological background to the whole of Carthaginian history, giving an invaluable summary of all the concrete evidence which had not come to light in Meltzer's time, and which now lies scattered in inaccessible North African, Spanish, and French publications. The picture is a striking one: the Punic City of Carthage, clearly delimited by burial grounds in use until 146, instead of covering the whole peninsula, shrinks to a strip along its east shore, from the taenia to Cape Carthago; its population, allowing a density as great as that of nineteenth-century Naples, cannot be stretched to more than 130,000 souls: the population of the other Libyphoenician cities taken all together comes to less: that of the islands, the outlying factories on the Algerian and Moroccan coast, and the settlements in Spain, was quite insignificant. And the Phoenicians of Africa had no hinterland: to the end they lived huddled within their walls, and the only open door was the sea.

The material found in the graves and shrines is equally significant. Carthaginian art remained like Phoenician, a second-hand edition of Egyptian, and direct imports from Egypt continued at least till the fourth century, when they began to pass, under the Ptolemaic regime, through a Greek medium. Meanwhile, with the introduction of the Greek cult of Demeter and Persephone in 396, Greek civilisation began to penetrate the Carthaginian empire directly from Sicily, and the struggle of Greek and Egyptian influences ended by the third century in a complete victory for the former. The Carthaginians not only adopted Greek fine art, but even such common commercial articles as lamps were either imported from Greek manufacturing centres or

imitated at Carthage from Greek patterns. The Greek was not only the best artist and philosopher in the Mediterranean: his imagination and intellect worked upon every side of life, and made his material civilisation the most efficient as well. The Phoenician could not produce articles of such quality: he could only work on his traditional lines: the growing Greek surpassed him in his own business without an effort.

Why, then, was Carthage in the third century still the wealthiest state in the Mediterranean? Why had the Greeks not taken from them the markets they were so much more competent to supply, and drawn to themselves the wealth they could use to so much better purpose? Because Carthage was efficient in one thing the Greeks lacked: they screened their industrial inefficiency by an uncompromising imperialism: they had created a naval organisation strong enough to close entirely to the outer world the whole south-western basin of the Mediterranean from the Ebro to Sardinia and Palermo, and the coasts of the Atlantic beyond that. All the commerce of this western world must pass through the harbours of Carthage: Spaniards and Libyans bought Greek wares like everyone else (for who would buy Punic?), but they bought them at an enhanced price through Carthaginian middlemen, and sold their own products at a depressed price to Carthaginian monopolists. It was an empire like the Spanish empire in America, and was bound to crumble as it did under the combined pressure of its subjects' hatred, its own moral and intellectual bankruptcy, and the appearance on its frontier of a new military power. When Carthage was annihilated, Libyphoenicians, Africans, and Spaniards began to revive, and it is difficult to recover traces of the Carthaginian regime beneath the magnificent material civilisation produced by these peoples under the Roman empire.

The central part of the book is filled with a detailed and drastic criticism of the sources for the Hannibalic War. The author really grapples with Livy, and reaches most useful results. His

scepticism (about the 'official' tables of legions on commission at the beginning of each year, for instance) is nearly always convincing: but something more positive might be gained if he sifted the chaff instead of just throwing it away. The summary of the war itself is excellent, and was finished after the appearance of Kromayer's third and fourth volumes, which again increases its value. Perhaps Mr. Kahrstedt is inclined to make too great a hero of Masinissa: this Libyan Augustus is too good a foil to the petrifying, obscurantist Phoenician regime

whose heir he was in Africa. But the fruitfulness of the direct contact between Italian and Libyan is well brought out, and his political misfortunes seem even to have bettered the commercial prospects of the Phoenician, though here (page 108) we cannot pass over an unworthy defence of the partition of Poland.

The arrangement of the book is clumsy; but that is the subject's fault. Altogether, it is a very effective presentation of important material from a striking point of view.

LARFELD'S HANDBOOK OF GREEK EPIGRAPHY.

Griechische Epigraphik, dritte Auflage (I. von Müller u. R. von Pöhlmann, *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Bd. I., Abt. 5). Von W. LARFELD. 1 vol. Lex. 8vo. Pp. xii + 536. 4 tables. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1914. M. 10 paper; M. 12 bound.

FOR all who are interested in Greek epigraphy—and their number is happily on the increase as the debt which all students of Hellenic life and thought owe to the inscriptions becomes greater and more widely recognised—the appearance of this fresh edition of Larfeld's *Griechische Epigraphik* is an event of no ordinary importance. The first scholar who attempted a comprehensive survey of the whole field was J. Franz in his *Elementa epigraphices Graecae* (Berlin, 1840), which for forty-five years remained the standard, and indeed the only, book of its kind. It was then superseded by two works which appeared in rapid succession, S. Reinach's *Traité d'Épigraphie Grecque* (Paris, 1885) and G. Hinrichs' chapter in the first volume of Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Nördlingen, 1886). In the second edition of this volume (Munich, 1892) the section on Greek epigraphy was entrusted to W. Larfeld, who carried out his task with such marked success that his work, though not for all pur-

poses superseding that of Reinach, has been generally accepted as the standard authority on the subject with which it deals. Ten years later the same indefatigable scholar, amongst whose services to science we must not forget the admirable summaries of the progress of Greek epigraphy in 1883-87 and in 1888-94 contributed to Bursian-Müller's *Jahresberichte*,¹ brought out the second volume of his *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*, a monumental tome of more than 950 pages, which contains a careful analysis of the contents of Volumes I.-III. of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, a detailed examination of the development of the Attic epigraphical script, and an exhaustive discussion of the formulae of Attic inscriptions. This was followed in 1907 by the first volume of the same work, devoted to the definition and history of Greek epigraphical studies, general considerations relative to the engraving, fortunes, discovery, and critical study of inscriptions, a full account of the origin and development of Greek writing as found upon stone and metal, and a classification of these documents with special reference to their formulae.

The work now before us forms part of the first volume of Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch*, which is now appearing in a third and wholly new edition under the

¹ lii. 379 ff., lx. 442 ff., lxvi. 1 ff., lxxxvii. 126 ff.

general editorship of R. von Pöhlmann. It marks an immense advance upon its predecessor, owing partly to the striking progress made during the intervening years in epigraphical study and discovery, and partly to the greater fulness of treatment which the writer has here allowed himself. Its relation to Larfeld's *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* is not easy to define exactly. In general terms we may say that it reproduces without serious divergence the arrangement adopted in the first volume of the *Handbuch*; while considerably shortening the introduction and the history of Greek epigraphy as well as the whole of the 'General Section,' it aims at incorporating in the following 'Special Section,' which deals with the script and the formulae of inscriptions, not only all that is of greatest value in the corresponding section of the *Handbuch*, but also a considerable amount of material taken from the second, or specifically Attic, volume of the larger work. The book thus strikes a happy mean between the author's two previous works, and, while the specialist will still turn, at least occasionally, to the fuller discussions of the *Handbuch*, it provides the ordinary student, in a smaller compass and for a moderate price, with a handbook quite adequate to meet his requirements, and will prove of no small benefit even to the professed epigraphist. To the latter its compactness and accuracy will make it a welcome boon, for the former its fulness and comprehensiveness render it an indispensable aid.

Every page of the volume bears witness to the thoroughness with which the work of the author and of the proof-reader has been carried out, and the number of typographical errors is remarkably small for a book of this nature. Here and there, however, an error or omission has remained undetected: thus, for example, 'nicht' has twice been omitted (p. 219, l. 4 from end; p. 493, l. 13), *ταρακύνισμα* appears in place of *παράκύνισμα* (p. 294), '2. Jahrh.' on p. 486 is a misprint for '3. Jahrh.,' the reference to the Thespian decree on p. 346 should be M 228, that to the decree of Cius M 539, that to a Coan list (p. 503) S 619, while on

p. 339 the reference to a decree of Stratus (M 310) is accidentally omitted. Occasionally errors occur which are more likely to prove seriously misleading: thus on p. 435 Larfeld leaves unnoticed the corrected readings of *I.G.* i. 467 and Suppl. 477 l given by Wilhelm in his *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, 1 ff., and that too though he refers on p. 136 to this passage in Wilhelm's great work, and on p. 501 he states that the contributions recorded in *I.G.* iii. 1296 are 'fast ausschliesslich ein Obol,' while as a matter of fact they probably amount without exception to ten drachmas each. The section devoted to the 'decimal' numeral system (p. 291 ff.) is perhaps the most obviously faulty in the book: references to the *C.I.G.* or other collections are constantly given even where inscriptions have been much more recently and correctly published in the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, which the author cites for Attic texts only, and the result of this or of some other cause is a series of grave errors. Thus what is said about 'eine fünffache Wiederholung in der Anordnung = = | in einer trözenischen Bauinschrift bei Le Bas, Voyage arch. II 157a' is misleading, since an examination of the text in question (*I.G.* iv. 823) shows that — represents an obol and | a quarter of an obol. The exposition of the Troezenian system which follows is very inadequate, that of the Nemean notation is wholly at fault (see *I.G.* iv. 481), and the peculiar characteristic of the systems which meet us at Thespiae and Orchomenus, their possession of a special sign for 30 and, in the case of Thespiae, for 300 also, is overlooked, and the sign for 30 is interpreted as signifying 50. Similarly the account of the numerals used in the Epidaurian building-inscriptions must be corrected and supplemented by reference to *I.G.* iv. 1485 ff., and I have attempted elsewhere (*J.H.S.* xxxiii. 27 ff.) to explain more correctly the system in use at Chalcedon. For these and other points, however, it will be sufficient to refer to my remarks in *B.S.A.* xviii. 98 ff. This whole section might with advantage have been somewhat lengthened, as also several sections in that portion of the book which deals

with 'Privatrechtliche Inschriften' (pp. 504-510); if it was felt undesirable to increase the bulk of the volume, compensation might have been found by omitting a considerable part of the discussion of the Attic and Delphian short-hand-systems (pp. 281-290), which are somewhat disproportionately long.

There is a further respect in which the book is capable of improvement. The useful bibliographies which precede or follow many of its sections have been insufficiently revised and brought up to date. Only a few examples can here be given to enforce this contention. Calderini's work, *La manomissione . . . in Grecia*, should be cited on p. 508 in addition to Drachmann's *De manumissione servorum apud Graecos*; on p. 464 Pedrolì's *Tributi degli alleati* and Cavaignac's *Histoire financière d'Athènes* should figure along with Köhler's *Urkunden und Untersuchungen*; Wilhelm's article (*Jahreshefte*, vii. 105 ff.) on the Attic *defixiones*, Lattermann's *Griechische Bauinschriften*, Bannier's articles

on the formulae of Attic financial documents and treasure-lists, and Dinsmoor's brilliant reconstruction of the building-record of the Parthenon (*Amer. Journ. Arch.* xvii. 53 ff.) may also be mentioned among works which deserved citation, though the last-named scholar's examination of the inscriptions dealing with the Erechtheum and the Propylaea (*vol. cit.* 242 ff., 371 ff.) may have appeared too late to be noticed.

But it would be unjust to insist further upon the presence of these flaws in Larfeld's work. The book is one in which German scholarship may take a legitimate pride, one which certainly places all epigraphists under a debt of gratitude to its author, and a growing familiarity with its contents will but lead the student to an increasing admiration of the industry, the patience, and the thoroughness to which it bears so eloquent a testimony.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

Les Mystères d'Éleusis. 4to. 1 vol. Pp. 497. Paris: A. Picard, 1914. 10 fr.

To review M. Foucart's *Mystères d'Éleusis* is rather sad work. Everyone who has worked at the Mysteries owes much to M. Foucart. In 1895 and 1900 he published in the *Memoires* of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres two monographs on the subject, which are indispensable, but not very accessible. The present work is a development of these monographs. They are brought up to date, and everyone will be glad to possess them in handier form. References to recent authors abound, but alas! in his main contentions the new book only marks a retrogression. In spite of a chapter on the Ægean, we have the same obstinate prepossession in favour of Egyptian origins, and, worse, we have a rather violent reaction against the modern

anthropological method as represented by Sir James Frazer.

M. Foucart's son, M. Georges Foucart, won for himself in 1912 a brief and unenviable notoriety by his *Histoire des Religions et Methode Comparée*, in which he shows chiefly a complete misunderstanding of the anthropological method he believes himself to be criticising. M. Foucart is an Egyptologist, and his motto is *πάντα ἄρχαι Αἴγυπτος*. His much more eminent father did good service in calling attention to analogies between Egyptian and Eleusinian mysteries, analogies which the much abused 'anthropological school' would be the first to acclaim. But alas! the father is now the disciple of the son, and outside of Egypt no 'origins' are possible. To refute this belated heresy nowadays would not be profitable.

B.

Roman Cooks. By CORNELIA GASKINS HARCUM (Johns Hopkins University Ph.D. Dissertation). Pp. 86. Baltimore: J. H. Furst Co.

THIS useful little monograph well deserves to be placed by the side of that of E. M. Rankin (Chicago, 1907) on the Greek *Μάγειροι*, and will prove useful to students of Roman life and manners as well as to those who have to explain Plautus and Petronius. Miss Harcum supplies a valuable list of cooks' names, for which she has searched epigraphical and other sources, and discusses sensibly the high prices that were given for competent *cordons bleus* and the question of cooks' *collegia*. The materials for later imperial times are perhaps less carefully worked out than those of an earlier date. Miss Harcum mentions the two brothers in Apuleius (*Met.* x. 10), one a cook and the other a sweetmeat baker (=the Greek Lucius 46), but not the resourceful *chef* (*Met.* viii. 31 = Lucius 39) who was prepared to substitute a donkey's haunch for a stolen piece of venison, nor the cook-maid Fotis (*Met.* ii. 7 = Lucius 6), who looked so pretty as she stirred the pot that Lucius could not help kissing her. Perhaps these omissions are deliberate, because they occur in passages derived from the Greek. It is satisfactory to know that at some future time Miss Harcum proposes 'to work up carefully the whole subject of Roman dishes.'

Kleine Schriften von Franz Skutsch; herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll. Pp. xxvi + 531. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914. M. 20.

OUR best thanks are due to Professor Kroll for putting into book-form these magazine-articles of his brilliant predecessor in the Breslau Professorship. Everything that Skutsch wrote was emphatically a *κτῆμα ἐς αἰεί*. Indeed there would be little exaggeration in saying that nearly all the progress, the real, indubitable progress made in Latin (Comparative) Philology in the last 20 or 25 years is to be found in these *Opuscula*. Anyone who reads along with them the annual reports on 'Lateinische Grammatik,' contributed

by Skutsch at first to Vollmöller's 'Bericht' and subsequently to 'Glotta,' will put himself abreast of the vanguard of research and will be in no danger of inflicting upon us what we may call the 'Rip van Winkle' type of theories—theories wearing the garb and using the language of a bygone period of knowledge.

Skutsch was a pupil of Buecheler as well as of Brugmann. And Latin literature has a prominent place in these writings of his, especially the literature of the Republic, Plautus, Terence, Catullus, etc. Anthropology too is represented in an essay on the Feast of St. Joseph at Rimini with its 'scegavecchia,' which is compared with the *Manurium* of Lydus de mens. p. 105 W. Even Shakespeare's phrase 'God save the mark' is the subject of an interesting discussion on pp. 328-333, where it is brought into connection with Petronius' *salvum sit quod tango*.

Skutsch treats all this variety of theme in the same penetrative, lucid, convincing, sympathetic style. *Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.

W. M. LINDSAY.

A Short History of Rome for Schools. By E. E. BRYANT, M.A. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 262 (Index). 24 illustrations, mostly coins and portraits; also maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. 3s. 6d. net.

THIS is a very careful, accurate, and clear history of Republican Rome for the upper and middle forms of schools by one who is himself a schoolmaster. The arrangement of subject-matter is very good and convenient, and we like the plan of setting out only a few important dates at the end of the chapters, and the occasional suggestions for reading in Latin authors or Shakespeare or Macaulay. The style is well suited to boys and girls of about fourteen years; it would hardly be understood by younger children. The amount of information readably given is really wonderful, and the book is certainly worth its moderate price. It is not heavy in weight, and this is a great advantage where there are day-

scholars. We should sum it up as thoroughly useful, but like too many schoolbooks it altogether fails to make any serious appeal to a child's imagination. For this we do not entirely blame the author, who may definitely prefer to have facts in a convenient printed form in the hands of his boys, and to supply the imaginative stimulus by word of mouth, and we can only hope that that stimulus will be supplied by all masters who adopt the book, otherwise the boys will hardly have been fairly treated.

L. E. M.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

Petronius, with an English translation by MICHAEL HESELTINE: *Seneca, Apocolocyntosis*, with an English translation by W. H. D. ROUSE. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxii + 418. Heinemann, 1913. 5s. net.

THIS translation of *Petronius* is an extremely difficult work to review. Mr. Heseltine has a virile and attractive style, and his English is pleasant, straightforward, and readable; but his knowledge of Latin is altogether on a lower plane. One reviewer¹ has already called attention to certain examples of his translation I feel bound to add here a few more, leaving aside doubtful passages, and mentioning only some where he is certainly wrong.

Page 16, l. 3, *muliercula* cannot be rendered by 'girl'; *muliercula* can mean 'a little woman,' or 'a mere woman,' or 'a light woman,' but not 'a young woman': p. 48, l. 16, 'every kind of remark' is a slovenly mistranslation of *omnium textorum dicta*: p. 98, l. 15, *aequum est* ('is it right that?') is translated 'might as well . . . as . . .': p. 114, l. 16, *ad stelas facere*, 'to look at the epitaphs'; I fear that this rendering cannot be attributed wholly to the translator's delicacy: p. 284, the opening three lines of ch. cxxviii. are mistranslated; Circe is not reciting a catalogue of her charms, but asking ironically if she has any of a very

definite class of physical imperfections: p. 300, l. 1, *a puero* does not here mean 'in boyhood' (or even 'from boyhood'), but 'from the boy': p. 320, l. 4, *fortuna communis* is not 'our usual luck,' but 'the fortunes of the party': p. 362, l. 3, *dat munus* could not possibly mean 'yields herself'; it is nothing more than 'makes presents.' Mr. Heseltine has enriched the *Satyricon* with a new character (Index, s.v. Tullia), and with a new reading (p. 72, l. 21), where the speaker declares that in the good old days the penny loaf was so large that two people could hardly finish it at a meal (*non potuisses cum altero devorare*); Mr. Heseltine prints *altera*, with no indication that the manuscript and all editors have read *altero*, and translates 'you and your better half together.'

I have felt more than a little reluctance in setting down these mistakes, because Mr. Heseltine's work is, in its own way, so good (and Dr. Rouse's rendering of the *Ludus de morte Claudii* is both lively and scholarly); but if the book is to be praised (and it deserves to be praised), let it be for its real merits, and not for others which it does not possess.

S. GASELEE.

Magdalene College, Cambridge.

Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur. Von DR. MARTIN SCHANZ. IVter Teil. Erste Hälfte. Second and enlarged edition. Munich: Beck, 1914.

THE first half of the fourth part of Dr. Schanz's *Römische Litteratur* covers the period from the accession of Constantine to the death of Theodosius the Great. This period corresponds almost to a year with that of the poetic activity of Ausonius, whose genius is, indeed, the most notable of the merely literary phenomena of the epoch (Claudian's earliest poem was not written until the year in which Ausonius died). Ausonius is the only poet of this period; and the only prose writer who possesses originality of mind or style is Ammianus Marcellinus—a really great man who had a healthy contempt for Juvenal (28. 4. 14), and who kept his head

¹ *Cambridge Review*, xxxv. 263.

splendidly when his friends supposed Cato and Varro to be things to eat (30. 4. 17). The period was, as a fact, not so barren of literary knowledge as Ammianus suggests. For it was the age of the great grammarians—Nonius, Victorinus, Charisius, Diomedes, Servius, Aelius Donatus; and beside the professional scholarship of the grammarians, there flourished at the same time the gentlemanly scholarship of the Symmachi and Nicomachi.

Donatus was the teacher of St. Jerome, and in Dr. Schanz's new volume Jerome occupies a larger space than any other writer. This is, no doubt, a just proportion; for, when all is said, the most real interest of this age is not literature, but the perplexed endeavour to establish a *modus vivendi* between literature and religion. Jerome is not the only scholar of the period who has seen a vision and heard an accusing voice calling him 'a Ciceronian and no Christian.' This divided spiritual consciousness troubles the whole century. Whether Jerome composed to his own satisfaction the strife between Christian and Ciceronian, we cannot say. But it is difficult to overestimate, even for secular literature, the importance of his work. His version of the Scriptures had an immense influence in fixing the Latin diction of the Middle Ages. His *Chronicle* laid the foundation upon which Scaliger subsequently built the *Thesaurus Temporum*—that great work in which one-half of modern scholarship has its forgotten source. Above all, he had that instinct for binding together the different ages of the human spirit which is a principal character of scholarship.

Dr. Schanz's second edition adds one hundred pages of new matter. Of these about eighty deal with Christian literature. The most important additions are, naturally, to the Bibliography, which now carries us down to the year 1913. The book, as a whole, maintains the high level which Dr. Schanz has always led us to expect from him (see *Class. Rev.*, xxviii., p. 103).

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

History of Roman Private Law. Part II: Jurisprudence. By E. C. CLARK, LL.D. 2 vols. Pp. xiv+802. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Price 21s. net.

THIS work, a product of careful and exact scholarship, represents the second part of a production by Dr. Clark dealing with the study of Roman Law. The first part of the work, rather than the two volumes now under consideration, is the more applicable to review in a publication dealing with classical learning. The subject of the present work is not the substance of Roman Law strictly considered. The volumes embody Dr. Clark's carefully weighed and admirably expressed conclusions as to the general bases of human law. They constitute a commentary on the work of Austin, Ihering, and others, rather than an essay in what is called classical learning or scholarship in the narrower sense. As such, the work is more fitted for discussion and examination by jurists than by classical scholars. The proper place for its review is such a journal as the *Law Quarterly Review* rather than the *Classical Review*. To the classical scholar, popularly so described, Dr. Clark has in fact very little to say.

Nor is the work by any means limited to the field of Roman Law. How little this is the case may be judged from the fact that its author devotes chapters to the consideration not only of the English Law in its bearing on persons or things, rights or wrongs, but on the juridical aspect of such modern and utterly un-Roman devices as the Referendum, which political expedient of modern times is discussed from the point of view of its applicability to such an organism as the British Empire. Dr. Clark is a brilliant, and often daring, original thinker. He is certainly not hide-bound by tradition. He is perfectly willing to investigate the theories and ideas of those leaders of jurisprudence who have been consistently accepted as authorities on the subject, and he is prepared on occasion, after deliberation, to differ from conclusions to which modern students of jurisprudence have been tempted to profess

perhaps too mute and unprotesting an obedience. One cannot whole-heartedly accept his argument on every occasion where he differs from older authorities. But in every such case he has something illuminating to say, and his conclusions deserve to be well weighed and considered. His book is a valuable addition to a subject which perhaps more than most of its fellow branches of academic study requires the reviving influence of fresh thought and new methods of criticism.

J. S. B. R.

Lexique de Géographie Ancienne. Par M. BESNIER, Professeur à l'Université de Caen. 1 vol., 12mo. Pp. xx+893. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck. 10 francs.

PROF. BESNIER has taken for the limits of his lexicon the Index Nominum in the *Atlas Antiquus* of Justus Perthes. Every place is made the subject of an article giving (a) its modern name and a reference to the map in Perthes' *Atlas*, (b) a short account of its history and geography, and (c) complete references, as far as possible, to all texts, inscriptions, coins, etc., where it is mentioned. Prof. Besnier has acted on the sensible principle that the more famous a place is, the less need it has of a long historical and geographical description under heading (b); but the references under heading (c) are as complete as they can be made. A typical article will show the scope of the work:

VELITRÆ, Velletri, 15 A 2. Ville d'Italie (rég. I., Latium, aux confins des *Latini* et des *Volsci*), à l'extrémité méridionale des monts Albains, dominant les marais Pontins, à l'E. de la *via Appia*. Prise par Ancus Marcius; colonie romaine dès 494 av. J. C.; alliée aux Volsques contre Rome après l'invasion gauloise de 390; plusieurs fois vaincue au IV^e s., jusqu'à la soumission définitive du Latium en

338. Municipale florissant dans la suite; colonie de Claude. Patrie de la *Gens Octavia*; Auguste y naquit. On récoltait aux environs un vin très apprécié, le meilleur d'Italie après le Falerne.— Liv. II. 30, etc.; Dionys. III., 41, etc.; Diod. XIV., 34; Str. V., 237; Sil. VIII., 376; Pl. III., 64; XIV., 65; Suet. *Aug.* 1 sq. et 94; Dio C. XLV., 1; *Lib. Col.* 238: CIL I², p. 44 et 191; X. p. 651. 988, 1018.

Years of patient labour have been given to the making of this valuable lexicon. All students will be grateful to Prof. Besnier for what he has done, but we cannot avoid a slight regret that Murray's *Classical Atlas* was not made the companion volume. Prof. Besnier's work is too useful to be tied down to Justus Perthes' *Atlas Antiquus*.

A. J. B. GREEN.

The Legal Terms common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament. By W. D. FERGUSON (Chicago Historical and Linguistic Studies). II. ii. 3. Cambridge University Press, for University of Chicago, 1913. 3s.

THE writer of this lexical study has brought together much serviceable material from Macedonian inscriptions, old and new: he conscientiously includes one dated A.D. 1705. Sixteen words are treated, viz.: βουλή, βουλευτής, γερουσία, δῆμος, διαθήκη, δόγμα, δοκέω, ἐκκλησία, κληρονόμος, κλῆρος, λειτουργέω and -ία, νόμος, πολιτάρχης, πραιτώριον, πρεσβεύω -εία -ευτής -ύτερος, στρατηγός, ταμείον. There is also a full word-index to the Inscriptions, for which we are grateful. The discussions of the several words involved suffer somewhat from needless expansion, and the light thrown on the N.T. use of these words is hardly commensurate with the expenditure of eighty good-sized pages upon them. But the material is there, and that is the main thing.

J. H. M.

OBITUARIES

C. H. KEENE.

CLASSICAL learning in Ireland has sustained a serious loss by the death of Professor Charles Haines Keene, which occurred on February 13. Born in 1847, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1865, and had a distinguished course, graduating with First-Class Honours in Classics, and Second-Class in Logics and Ethics. He also obtained very high honours in Hebrew. His tastes were always for learning and scholarship, and he had all through life to the very end the true spirit of a scholar, in that 'gladly would he learn and gladly teach.' In 1876 he went to the Queen's College, Belfast, as locum tenens for the Professor of Latin, and performed the arduous duties of that Chair with conspicuous success. He was one of those men—and they are not many—who, without any effort whatever, are able to maintain discipline in large classes and gain the respect and regard of students. From 1888 to 1890 he acted for the Professor of Greek in Belfast with equal success. In 1895 he was elected Professor of Greek at Cork, a post which (along with that of Dean of the Faculty of Arts since 1909) he held until just before his death. From 1900 to 1910 he was a Fellow of the Royal University. He was a constant and earnest worker, never sparing himself in any respect in which he considered that he could bring distinction on, or promote the usefulness of, the positions he held. His principal works were editions of Calpurnius (1887), of the *Electra* of Euripides (1893), of some books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and of Rutilius (1907), an author for whom he had a great affection. In all these he exhibited sound and solid learning, and a just appreciation of the spirit of the authors. Keene had a grave courtesy of manner, and withal a very quick sense of humour; and he was a most agreeable conversationalist. His nature was essentially human and sympathetic, so that he was capable of putting himself in the place of junior students and feeling what would interest them; and thus he was able to produce for such readers excellent little volumes

of judiciously chosen selections from Xenophon, Caesar, and Pliny. He was a frequent contributor to the *Classical Review*. He was one of the most sociable of men; and, possessing a good knowledge of foreign languages and considerable powers of observation, he used to enjoy foreign travel thoroughly, and gain therefrom very great advantage. He was a prominent personality in the City of Cork. For two years he was President of the Cork Literary and Scientific Society, one of the most important societies of the kind in the country. He was of course admired in that city for his learning, and respected universally for his high character, though he made no secret of his very definite Unionist opinions; and his kindly and considerate nature won for him the affection of all classes. His loss will be very sadly felt in that genial community.

L. C. PURSER.

S. SUDHAUS.

LATIN scholars will learn with regret the death of Dr. S. Sudhaus, of the University of Kiel, who was killed in the first weeks of the war.

Dr. Sudhaus was one of the delegates of German Universities who visited Oxford on the occasion of the Tercentenary Celebrations of the Bodleian Library in the summer of 1903. He stayed in Corpus, where he was much pleased to make the acquaintance of Robinson Ellis. He and Ellis took a long walk together, conversing exclusively in Latin and upon Latin subjects. 'I didn't like to ask him,' said Ellis in his naive way, 'how he came to think the first *e* of *creber* short' (an allusion to a blunder in Sudhaus' *Aetna*). Both Ellis and others who met Sudhaus in Oxford were much impressed by his simple good-nature and by his vigour of mind. As a scholar he is best known, at any rate in this country, by his edition of the *Aetna*. The preface to Ellis' edition of that poem assesses with perfect fairness both the merits and the defects of Sudhaus' work. Ellis speaks of him as 'a perfectly independent in-

quirer,' whose discussion of critical and exegetical difficulties throughout goes hand-in-hand with an enlarged scientific perception, such as neither Jacob nor Munro could claim.' His principal defect was not individual but the mark of a school—he was 'trained to the belief that the Ueberlieferung, or MS. tradition, of the text is to be defended at all costs.' Sudhaus' *Aetna* was published

in 1898. Six years previously he had published, in the Teubner series, *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*. In 1909 appeared his *Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica*. He wrote a good deal in the learned periodicals: and it was reserved for him to make quite recently one of the few certain corrections which have ever been made in the text of Horace (S. I, 4, 35).

CORRESPONDENCE

PROP. III. x. 27.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—I owe it to Dr. Postgate to acknowledge that his text in the *Corpus Poetarum* has *gravius*; the language of my note made a too sweeping implication that all editions gave *gravibus*.—Yours.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

April 11, 1915.

AESCHYLUS, *PERSAE*, 332-3.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—May I put on record a suggestion as to one of the passages discussed in Mr. Sheppard's interesting paper upon a play which is *Ἀρεως μεστόν* and good reading at any time? It was proposed in a school edition in 1879, and so is eight years older than the *Classical Review*, and I have had no opportunity of bringing it before scholars. But I still think, though I may be sanguine, that it is right. In 332-3 M has

τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων ὑπεμνήσθην περί·
πολλῶν παρόντων' ὀλίγ' ἀπαγγέλλω κακά.

And so Wecklein. In M *νυν* (*sic*) is added over the line by a later hand. There is a scholium to the second line *λείπει τὸ κακῶν*.

Omit 332. Then 333 closes and clenches the messenger's narrative in a manner which is abrupt and also Aeschylean. For such a single line without a connecting particle, cp. *Agam.* 680 or 1046 (Dind.), also such half lines as *πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον* (582). When the best has been done to fit, 332 is a poor line. The process by which it was constructed is perhaps best left to the imagination of readers. Briefly, *ἀρχόντων* (perhaps *τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων*) is a gloss, as Blomfield, Hermann; not, however, on some word which it has replaced, as *ἀρχῶν*, *ταγῶν*, but on *πολλῶν* in 333, which the writer, in spite of the scholium, or not having it before him, understood to be masculine, and to refer to such Persian captains as those named above. So understood, the genitive requires *περί* or the full *ὑπεμνήσθην περί*, probably a tag from some play familiar to him.

δὲ in 333 is merely intrusive. Still, it would

be right to know *which* secondary MSS. show it. It is found in two late MSS. in the Bib. Nat. and, I think, in several now in England, but none of these need count.

A. O. PRICKARD.

March 19, 1915.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I add two queries on the text of Plutarch's *Moralia*.

1. *De Defectu Oraculorum*, c. 20, p. 420C, runs:

ῥηθέντων δὲ τούτων, ὁ Ἀμμόνιος, ὁρθῶς, ἔφη, 'μοι δοκεῖ Θεόφραστος ἀποφήνασθαι· τί γὰρ κωλύει φωνὴν δέξασθαι σεμνὴν καὶ φιλοσοφωτάτην· καὶ γὰρ ἀθετουμένη πολλὰ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων, ἀποδειχθῆναι δὲ μὴ δυναμένων, ἀναιρεῖ, καὶ τιθεμένη πολλὰ συνεφέλκεται τῶν ἀδυνάτων καὶ ἀνυπάρκτων·'

Query, read *καὶ τιθεμένη οὐ πολλὰ κ.τ.λ.*?

2. The fragment from Stobaeus ascribed to Themistius, but redeemed for Plutarch's dialogue *περὶ ψυχῆς* by Wytenbach in 1772, has in chap. ii. (Wytt., vol. v., p. 724; ed. Teub., vol. vii., p. 22):

καὶ τὴν τελευτήν ἀπόλυσιν καλοῦσιν· ἂν δὲ τέρμα σώματος.

Query, *ἂν δὲ ἔρῃ*, καὶ σώματος—i.e., 'if you ask the question (from what?), why from the body?' A. O. P.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN the notice of my *Elementary Latin Grammar* (*Classical Review*, February, 1915) my critic denies the truth of my statement that no imperative of *ēdo* occurs in Classical Latin, affirming that *es* occurs in Plautus (e.g. *Mil.* 677) and Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. Permit me to point out (1) that Plautus does not fall within my definition of 'Classical Authors' (see p. v Introd. of my *Grammar of Classical Latin*); (2) that the reading *es* in Ovid *l.c.* is merely conjectural and does not occur in any MS.

A. SLOMAN.

[Mr. R. T. Clark writes to say that the third of the emendations suggested by him in our March number (p. 48, Notes on *Vespa*) is 'unreservedly withdrawn.'—ED. C. R.]

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Aristotle* (Translated into English). De Mundo (E. S. Forster), 2s. net; Magna Moralia, Ethica Eudemia, De Virtutibus et Vitiis (W. D. Ross), 5s. net. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915.
- Ashley* (R. L.) Ancient Civilisation: A Text-book for Secondary Schools. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xxii+363. With a large number of illustrations, coloured maps, and maps in text. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Classical Philology*: A Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in the Languages, Literature, History, and Life of Classical Antiquity. Vol. X., No. 1. January, 1915. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 116. University of Chicago Press.
- Dalton* (O. M.) The Letters of Sidonius, translated, with Introduction and Notes. 2 vols. 7" x 5". Pp. clxxii + 86 + 268. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net each.
- Fairbanks* (A.) Athenian Lecythi, with outline drawing in matt colours on a white ground. Appendix: Additional Lecythi, with outline drawing in glaze varnish on a white ground. 11" x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+276. With 41 plates. New York and London: Macmillan, 1914. \$3.50 net.
- Gaselee* (S.) A Collotype Reproduction of Codex Traguriensis, containing the Cena Trimalchionis, etc. With Introduction and a Transcript. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 10". Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Paper boards, 15s. net.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XXV. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 210. Oxford: University Press, 1914. Paper boards, 6s. net.
- Haverfield* (F.) The Romanisation of Roman Britain. Third edition, enlarged. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 90. Oxford: University Press, 1915. Paper boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Jones* (F.) Intermediate Oral Latin Reader, based on Cicero's *De Senectute*, with extracts from Martial and Horace. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. 115. London: Blackie and Sons, 1915. Cloth, 2s.
- Keyes* (C. W.) The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Empire. (Doctor's Dissertation, Princeton University.) 9" x 6". Pp. 54. Oxford: University Press, 1915. 3s. 6d. net.
- Microz* (C. C.) The Gothic History of Jordanes. An English version, with an Introduction and a Commentary. 9" x 6". Pp. vi+188. Oxford: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Morey* (C. R.) Studies in East Christian and Roman Art: I. East Christian Paintings in the Freer Collection. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XII. 11" x 8". Pp. xiv+86. With 13 plates and 34 figures. Macmillans. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Mount* (C. B.) Excerpta quaedam Poeseos, Graece et Latine reddita. 7" x 5". Pp. 112. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1915. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Pliny* (Selected Letters). Edited by G. B. Allen. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 150. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Robertson* (A. T.) A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. 10" x 7". Pp. xl+1360. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Sandys* (Sir J. E.) A Short History of Classical Scholarship. 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi+455. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Slack* (S. B.) Analogies of Hebrew and Latin Grammar. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 16. Oxford: Parker and Co., 1915. 6d. net.
- Strangerways* (L. R.) P. Ovidi Nasonis Elegiaca. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. vi+74. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1914. (Ninth year of issue.) Edited by Cyril Bailey. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+187. London: John Murray, 1915. 2s. 6d. net.
- Tibulli* aliorumque carminum libri tres. Editio Altera. J. P. Postgate. Oxford Classical Text. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s.
- Tibullus* (Selections). Edited by J. P. Postgate. Second edition, revised. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. lii+228. London: Macmillan and Co., 1910. Cloth, 5s. net.

The Classical Review

JUNE, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

CLENARD AS AN EDUCATIONAL PIONEER.

II.

LET us remember that when Clenard began to teach at Louvain, in 1518, printing had only been introduced for about half a century. In 1474, John of Westphalia produced the first Louvain-printed book. An English scholar, the Rev. Henry Anstey, writing of the University of Oxford in the first half of the fifteenth century, i.e. just before the introduction of printing, says:¹ 'It is not easy for us to conceive what the difficulty must have been in acquiring and teaching the Latin language *without books*; and that literally was the problem that had to be solved. . . . The instruction was wholly oral. Without dictionaries or grammars, and in their Halls and Inns, crowded together as they certainly were without privacy or necessary quiet for preparation, it is difficult to conceive what must have been the discomfort, or worse, of the poor scholar in the long dark evenings of the autumn and winter terms, and what the labour of instruction during the hours of daylight. And it will be remembered that the Latin to be acquired was never considered at this time as an exercise of scholarship, a means to a cultured style, a classical education, but as a language, first for current use in disputations, chiefly

logical and theological; and for those who, after attaining the M.A. degree, proceeded to the higher steps, as an instrument for opening the treasures of a student's life, and moving freely in a literature of which such Latin was the only source.'

We can understand that a sympathetic teacher like Clenard might feel his time well spent if he wrote clear, short grammars to help the earnest student, in the early part of the sixteenth century, when the art of printing enabled his useful teaching experience to be embodied in textbooks, which would circulate far beyond his personal *clientèle*. For the mediaeval grammarian had glorified grammar by importing into it metaphysical conceptions and laborious compilations of grammatical rules and exceptions, which made grammar an end in itself—quite apart from any usefulness for the purpose of reading classical authors. Clenard's aim, therefore, became how to afford to the pupil the knowledge of just that amount of grammar which would enable him to read readily a Latin, Greek, or Hebrew author, and which would *form a basis* for speaking or writing in those languages. Skill in reading and writing a foreign or dead language Clenard recognised came from *practice* alone. No amount of even accurate statement of grammatical information learned beforehand in a textbook will be available when the pupil is in the midst of

¹ *Epistolae Academicæ*, Oxon. (1898), vol. i., p. xix.

actual reading of authors. He learns *usage* by reading authors, by observing the idioms and phrases, and even syntax and accident in passages, i.e. with the contexts in which they appear.

Clenard, like his great Louvain contemporary, J. L. Vives, understood what the latter says in his *de Tradendis Disciplinis* (1531): 'There is no need to frame systematic rules for learning a language which is in present and continual use'; and for this reason 'the language is learned better and more quickly from the people themselves.' Latin grammar is the result of the inferences which have been made as to what the Latin language once was 'when it was a vernacular and mother-tongue.' Both Vives and Clenard would agree that both Latin and Greek would be better learned from mixing with those who speak Latin and Greek correctly. But it was the great trouble of the Renaissance scholars that the old mediaeval tradition of Latin-speaking was antagonistic to the Latin of the classical authors. Latin and Greek grammar became matters of urgency because of the barbarisms introduced into both spoken and written Latin and Greek. As Vives says: 'The Spanish *barbarissans* is not understood by the German *barbarissans*, and *vice versa*.'

The problem of teaching Hebrew seemed to Clenard even still more difficult. He therefore first wrote a Hebrew, then a Greek, and finally a Latin grammar. His *Tabula in Grammaticen Hebraeam* was published in 1529 by Thierry Martens, the famous Louvain printer. His aim, as Professor Nève has said, was to show the structure of the language by a *coup d'œil*, and as in a mirror. He wrote his book with the deliberate intention of avoiding any injury to the use of the Hebrew textbook of his master, John Campensis, issued in 1528. His desire was to simplify, not to be comprehensive. He seems to have been successful. It was found that 'at the end of a few months' several students of his book were able 'to write letters in the form of themes.' He inspired readers with the feeling that Hebrew was not beyond their reach, and that the old Jewish grammarians had been unnecessarily prolix

and difficult.¹ Clenard followed the views of Vives: 'In the study of grammar I would wish the application of diligence, yet study should not be immoderate, lest the minds of students be overwhelmed with details.'² Yet, on the whole, Clenard was broader-minded than Vives with regard to the teaching of Hebrew. For Vives advised caution in the teaching of Hebrew. He inclines to restrict its study to the Hebrew of the Old Testament, for he fears there are deliberate falsifications by Jews, 'partly through their hatred of Christ, partly through inertia, since these people so often change their abodes, and have not leisure to bestow due labour on literature.' Clenard was rather more impressed with the idea of including Hebrew as a learned language, attractive to intellectual study like Greek, and, from the practical side, an instrument, perhaps, for the conversion of Jews to Christianity.

However, Clenard, with his characteristic versatility, turned his attention from Hebrew grammar to Greek grammar, for which, of course, there was a much greater call. Greek, of course, was the subject which all the aspiring students of the Renaissance period particularly regarded as the sign and seal of advanced studies. In 1530 at Louvain, the celebrated Rutger Rescius, of Louvain, published Clenard's *Institutiones linguae Graecae*. At this date it is worth notice that the man who was to become the best-known schoolmaster in Europe, John Sturm, was the partner of Rescius. Published thus by a future schoolmaster, the book was dedicated to a schoolmaster of Malines, Francis Hoverius, to whom in later years from Paris, Evora, and Braga, Clenard addressed some of his charming letters.

The *Institutiones* consists of—

1. The *Institutiones absolutissimae*, i.e. the amount of grammar absolutely necessary for the student to be able to read Greek authors—the alphabet, the canons of pronunciation, the eight parts of speech, the five cases, the three numbers, declension of the article, the ten declen-

¹ See F. Nève, *La Renaissance des Lettres en Belgique*, pp. 231-2.

² J. L. Vives, *De Tradendis Disciplinis*, Bk. III., chap. i.

sions (i.e. five declensions of simple nouns, and five declension of contracted nouns), conjugations, verbs barytone and verbs contracted, verbs in μ , the different kinds of pronouns, articles, and adverbs, conjunctions and prepositions. It will be borne in mind that all Clenard's books are written in the Latin language.

2. *Annotationes in nominum verborumque difficultates*, i.e. notes on nouns-adjective, nouns of number, verbal nouns; notes on the declensions and heteroclitc nouns.

3. *Investigatio thematis in verbis anomalis*. This consists of a list of anomalous verbs, with their primitive tenses.

4. *Compendiosa et luculenta Syntaxeos ratio*.¹ Only peculiarities of syntax differing from Latin usage are noted and compared—cf. genitive absolute, Attic accusative, and so on. As for further treatment on Greek phrases, Clenard refers students to the *Commentarii Linguae Graecae* of the great Greek scholar, Budaeus, lately printed by Badius. 'Whoever wishes to take Greek studies seriously must get for himself that book.'

Henry Hallam's notice² of Budaeus and of Clenard states excellently the *status* of both these Greek grammarians: 'These Commentaries of Budaeus stand not only far above anything else in Greek literature before the middle of the sixteenth century, but are alone in their class. What comes next, but at a vast interval, is the Greek grammar of Clenard. It was, however, much beyond Budaeus, in extent of circulation, and probably, for this reason, in general utility.' But Clenard never counted himself a scholar; it was his proud boast to be as good a teacher as he could be.

In 1531 (the year after Clenard's *Institutiones* first appeared) Juan Luis Vives published his *de Tradendis Disciplinis*. He does not mention Clenard. The Greek grammar he recommends for the beginner is that of Gaza, the first part of

which had been translated from Greek into Latin by Erasmus. Some light is thrown on the difficulties of teaching of the times, when Vives says 'a Greek dictionary is still a desideratum.' On the other hand, there was a pedagogic gain in the pupil's self-activity in collecting from the authors whom he read all words and phrases newly observed, and virtually in making his own dictionary. Clenard's skeleton of a grammar by no means took away the necessity of using copious paper-books, to record not only words and phrases, dictionary-wise, but also unusual grammatical forms and syntactical usages. As to the long sway of Clenard in the schools, Hallam notes that in England Clenard's grammar owed much to Clenard, and points out that, even into the 19th century, Greek grammarians follow Clenard in most of the innovations which he made, and that the frequent choice of the same examples as those of Clenard can scarcely be an accident. If we wish to estimate Clenard's influence as a teacher, we must clearly attach considerable importance to the *Institutiones*.

Clenard also wrote *Meditationes graecanicae in artem grammaticam*, which he published in July, 1531, at Louvain, but by Bartholomew Gravius. This was dedicated to James Canta, chamberlain of the famous Cardinal Campeggio. In his dedicatory letter, Clenard states: 'Very often it has come into my mind to write a book which might serve as a teacher to those who study in all the poverty of deprivation of the living voice of the Greeks, after they have first tasted Greek grammar.'

M. Alphonse Roersch, of the University of Ghent, has admirably described this book,³ as follows: 'The epistle of St. Basil to St. Gregory of Nazianzen on life in solitude, accompanied by the Latin interpretation of Budaeus, and a word-for-word translation by Clenard: such is the basis of the *Meditationes*. Round the text are grouped an infinity of notes. They enclose, under the form of a continued and highly developed com-

¹ It may be noted that Vives gives his explanation of the fact that syntax is so cursorily treated by previous writers, even amongst the Greeks themselves. He says 'the Greek language was well spoken for a longer time by the people than was the case with Latin, so that there was less need for scrutiny and rules' (*De Tradendis Disciplinis*, Book III., chap. vii.).

² Introduction to the *Literature of Europe* (1855 edition), vol. i., p. 336.

³ *Étude sur la Vie et les Travaux de Nicolas Clénard*. Par Victor Chauvin et Alphonse Roersch. Bruxelles, 1900. Pp. 60, 61. This book is indispensable for a comprehensive and detailed study of Clenard.

mentary, a great number of grammatical explanations, and a very detailed analysis of grammatical forms. They often send the reader back to the *Institutiones* and render an account of certain special features which that book presents. Comparisons between the Greek and Latin are not rare. By the side of practical advice addressed to masters and pupils we find in the work remarks of a general kind, such as the considerations on the manner of interpreting authors. We meet, also, in places with reasonable criticism of Budé and some corrections of Basil's text.' Clenard thus, as it were, attempts to stand by the side of the student reading Basil's epistle, and the book, supplies the place of the oral teacher. To the student of the history of education to-day, such a volume reveals much of the pedagogical aims and processes in Clenard's thought, in some ways more effectively than a formal treatise on linguistic method.

Briefly, his merits as a Greek grammarian may well be described in the words of M. Roersch.¹ 'He is far removed from the scholastic subtleties of the Middle Ages. He is the declared enemy of all pedantry. To take away for ever from grammars their repellant aspect, to make easier the beginnings, always arduous, of the study of Greek, and thus to open out to everyone the treasures of ancient erudition—such is his aim. The pupil, instead of being frightened, must have obstacles cleared away. Instead of being wearied, the pupil must be interested from the first hour of study, and must have his interest retained by the earliest reading of authors.' There are many indications that it was the success of Clenard as an oral teacher which suggested to him the idea of his textbooks.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

NOTES ON GREEK ORATORS.

DEMOSTHENES.

Ol. 2. 15. ταῦθ' ἂ μὴδεὶς πώποτε κ.τ.λ. Rather perhaps τοιαῦθ' ἂ. Cf. *oia* in *De Pace* 5.

In 14 I would now read τὸ συνάμφοτερον for τοῦτο συναμφοτερον, not τοῦτο τό as I formerly suggested. In 2, if I was right in thinking an infinitive lost, and if the word was ἀμελεῖν or ὀλιγωρεῖν, it should, to avoid hiatus, follow προιεμένους.

Ib. 30. Surely the pronoun before ἐπιτάττειν should be a dative governed by it, as Lambinus and others have thought. Cf. on Andocides 1. 25 below.

Phil. 1. 32. It is to my mind very unlikely that Demosthenes, so careful an artist in words, allowed ὑπάρχει both to begin and to end the sentence. If in one of the two places we read ὑπάρξει, like ῥαδίως ἔσται following, the effect would be less unpleasant; but a quite different word would be better. The present repetition is like that of an unskilful impromptu speaker.

Ib. 48. I think Reiske was right in wishing to add something to οἱ δὲ λόγους πλάττοντες ἕκαστος περιερχόμεθα. οἱ δὲ are others, distinct from those already mentioned, whereas in λόγους πλάττοντες there is nothing new to distinguish them. All the men mentioned λόγους πλάττουν; the distinction is in the contents of the λόγοι. I suggest <ἐτέρους> ἕκαστος.

Ib. 51. νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἀδήλοις οὖσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τούτων ἐμαντῶ γενησομένοις ὁμῶς ἐπὶ τῷ συνοίσειν ὑμῖν ἂν πράξῃτε ταῦτα πεπεῖσθαι λέγειν αἰροῦμαι.

The first ἐπὶ is perfectly idiomatic in its use; the second (instead of διὰ τὸ πεπεῖσθαι) seems questionable, and in any case the double ἐπὶ is unskilful. Perhaps then it is the erroneous repetition of a copyist and Demosthenes really used διὰ τό. In the last words of the speech we might have expected ἡρῆμαι rather than αἰροῦμαι, like πεπαρησίασμαι above, but no doubt the present tense is admissible.

De Pace 11. ταῦτα τοῖνυν ἅπανθ' ὅσα φαίνομαι βέλτιον τῶν ἄλλων προορῶν

οὐδ' εἰς μίαν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὔτε δεινότητ' οὔτ' ἀλαζονείαν ἐπανοίσω.

Do not these words gravely accept and adopt the idea that there may be on the speaker's part some degree of pretence (ἀλαζονεία)? 'I will not refer them either to cleverness or to pretence (on my part).' Demosthenes' real words were, I think, not οὔτε . . . οὔτε, but εἴτε . . . εἴτε. Two passages in the *De Corona* are very apposite: 270 συγχωρῶ τὴν ἐμὴν εἴτε τύχην εἴτε δυστυχίαν ὀνομάζειν βούλει πάντων αἰτίαν γεγενῆσθαι, and 277 εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι τὴν ἐμὴν δεινότητα . . . ἔστω γὰρ καίτοι κ.τ.λ. εἰ δ' ἄρ' ἔστι καὶ παρ' ἐμοί τις ἐμπειρία τοιαύτη, κ.τ.λ., where he modestly throws doubt on his own δεινότης and substitutes another word, though of course between ἀλαζονεία and ἐμπειρία in themselves there is no affinity. In the *De Pace* then, reading εἴτε . . . εἴτε, the sense will be 'put them down to any cleverness real or pretended.'

Phil. 2. 25. ἀλλοτριωτάτας ταύτη' ταύτης? In *Isocr.* 14. 51 οὐδ' ἀλλότριον τυγχάνομεν ὑμῖν ὄντες the dative certainly need not depend on ἀλλότριον. Cf. on *Phil.* 4. 39 below.

Ib. 37. μετὰ τοῦ πάντων κινδύνου καὶ τῆς ζημίας δίκην ὑποσχεῖν. *Malim* τῆς πάντων ζημίας *Reiske*. I suggest καὶ ζημίας τὴν δίκην.

[*De Halon.*] 13. τὰ σύμβολα ταῦτα γίνεταί εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ μηδ' ἀμφισβητῆσαι εὐλόγως ἔτι Ποτειδαίας.

Read <ἀν> ἀμφισβητῆσαι.

De Cherson. 14. Probably ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνοίας τῆς αὐτῆς ἥσπερ (not ὥσπερ) νῦν, as was long ago suggested. Cf. *De F. Leg.* 342 ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἥσπερ νῦν ἔξουσίας, and on *Isocr.* 15. 141 below. *Phil.* 1. 39 τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὥσπερ is not a good parallel, because ὥσπερ, the adverb of manner, is very suitable to τρόπον.

Ib. 75. τὰ μὲν ἔργα παρ' ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ζητεῖτε, τὰ δὲ βέλτιστα ἐπιστήμη λέγειν παρὰ τοῦ παριόντος.

ἐπιστήμη has been doubted. Blass actually adopted on his own conjecture τὰ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἢ μὴ [*λέγειν*], in which the ἢ μὴ is really ludicrous, and Sandys suggests ἃ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἔνεστι λέγειν.

Plato *Ion* 532c may however be quoted in its defence, τέχνη καὶ ἐπιστήμη περὶ Ὀμήρου λέγειν ἀδύνατος εἶ, and also *Rep.* 422c, though the latter is not quite parallel. If ἐπιστήμη here is wrong, ἐπιστάμενον would seem preferable to the above suggestions.

Phil. 3. 30. ὅσα μὲν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἢ ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔπασχον οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἀλλ' οὖν ὑπὸ γνησίων γε ὄντων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡδικοῦντο.

No other instance of γνήσιος with a genitive is cited, nor does it seem quite natural. If there is none, perhaps we may think of γνησίως. Cf. [59.] 28 γνησίως μετέχοντας τῆς πολιτείας, 122 τοῦ παιδοποιεῖσθαι γνησίως, and *Isocr.* 4. 24 καλῶς καὶ γνησίως γεγόναμεν.

Ib. 4. 19. μηδ' αὐτοὶ χειροτονήσαντες πόλεμον βούλεσθε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὑμῖν ἐρίζειν εἰ δέον ἢ μὴ δέον ὑμᾶς τοῦτο πεποιθήκεναι.

The last words cannot be right. It is, or was, or will be, δέον or οὐ δέον to do a thing, never to have done it. From the very meaning of the word it must be prospective at the time to which it applies, expressing a need or obligation that something be then done. The author might have said εἰ δέον ἢ μὴ δέον τοῦτο πεποιθήκατε; with ὑμᾶς and the infinitive I conjecture something to be lost, e.g. λεκτέον or νομιστέον.

Ib. 39. εἰ τῇ παρὰ τῆς τύχης βοηθεία γεγονυία τοῖς ἀπόροις φθονοῦμεν.

τῆς . . . βοηθείας γεγονυίας, the usual construction with φθονῶ? Cf. on *Phil.* 2. 25 above.

Ib. 52. ὁ βασιλεὺς ἅπασιν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν οἰκείως ἔχει καὶ πάντων ἡκιστα δὴ ἡμῖν.

The latter clause has been gravely suspected and altered so as to produce an antithesis (πάντων ἡκιστα δὲ and the like). I agree rather with *Reiske* that a negative has been lost in the earlier words, <οὐκ> οἰκείως (= ἐχθρῶς or ὑπόπτως). The general sense of the context requires this. The author is saying that things are now more disturbed than ever before. Formerly there were two great parties, and the Persian king took up the cause of one or the other as suited him. Now there is much more confusion. The king is hostile to all Greeks alike, while each

State is fighting for its own hand and standing aloof from others. Friendship on the King's part to everyone could hardly be a cause of confusion (*ταραχή*). But the words *ἔπειτ' οὐχ ἦττον κ.τ.λ.* must be admitted to come in rather strangely.

ἀνοικείως may be preferable to *οὐκ οἰκείως*, but for the meaning *unfriendly* there seems no Attic authority, though it is probable enough.

De Megaloph. 11. To avoid hiatus, *᾽Ωρωπὸν κομίσασθαι* is at least as likely as Bensele's *κομίσασθαι τὸν ᾽Ωρωπὸν*. In 13, etc., the name occurs without an article, in other places with one.

De Foedere 16. *ἔτι δ' ἕτερον δείξω τὸ λελυκὸς τὰς συνθήκας*.

The article is oddly used after *ἕτερον*, an other thing. Indeed, the Greek words would rather mean 'I will show that what broke the agreement was something else.' Should we read *τι* for *τό*?

De Corona 50. *ὥσπερ ἑωλοκρασίαν τινά μου τῆς πονηρίας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀδικημάτων κατασκεδάσας, ἦν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν πρὸς τοὺς νεωτέρους τῶν πεπραγμένων ἀπολύσασθαι*.

ἀπολύσασθαι is used regularly in relation to such words as *τὰς αἰτίας*, *τὰ κατηγορούμενα*, *τὴν διαβολήν*, etc., but in application to *ἑωλοκρασίαν* its use is very loose and improper; we may doubt whether the exact and critical judgment of Demosthenes can really have approved it in a carefully written oration. On the other hand, he is, as a matter of fact, answering accusations brought against him (see 9-19), and this is actually conveyed in figurative fashion by *ὥσπερ . . . κατασκεδάσας*, which means that Aeschines was imputing to his rival what he himself had done. It is therefore with a good deal of hesitation that I suggest what has occurred to me, that Demosthenes' own word was *ἀπολούσασθαι*.

De Falsa Leg. 16. It seems very probable that the infinitives *θήσειν καὶ γράφειν* are wrong, like *χαίρήσειν* and *χαίρειν* in 320, and that *θήσει καὶ γράψει* should be read.

Ib. 76. *δῆλόν ἐστι σαφῶς ὅτι πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη συνεσκευάσθη τοῦ περὶ Φωκέας ὀλέθρου*.

The editors do not explain what sort of genitive they take *τοῦ ὀλέθρου* to be. It cannot be possessive. It cannot mean *in the matter of, concerning*, nor *with a view to, for*, as the simple genitive is not used in either of these senses. It is not parallel to 134 *ὁ τῆς εἰρήνης χρήματ' ἀνάλωσας*, *Ol.* 3. 22 *προπέποται τῆς αὐτίκα χάριτος τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα*, and various other passages where the genitive gives that on which money, etc., has been expended, a sort of converse to the genitive of price. *ἀνάλωσας, προπέποται*, and so on, express parting with something, *συνεσκευάσθη* the opposite idea of accumulation.

In default of any good explanation I suggest *πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη συνεσκευάσθη <τό> τοῦ περὶ Φωκέας ὀλέθρου*. *τό* or *τά* with the genitive is well known in Demosthenes (Rehdantz, *Index s.v. Artikel*). I understand *πᾶσα ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη* like *Soph. El.* 301 *ὁ πάντ' ἀναλκίς οὗτος, ἡ πᾶσα βλάβη*, *Phil.* 927 *ὦ πῦρ σὺ καὶ πᾶν δεῖμα*, *Ar. Thesm.* 787 *ὡς πᾶν ἐσμέν κακὸν ἀνθρώποις*, *Herod.* 1. 32 *πᾶσα ἐστὶ ἄνθρωπος συμφορῇ*. *συνεσκευάσθη* is an elaborated *ἐστὶ*. *Ar. Ach.* 121 *εὐνοῦχος ἐσκευασμένος*, *dressed as a eunuch*, and 729 *χοίρους ὑμέ σκευάσας* are partly parallel, as the predicates *εὐνοῦχος, χοίρους, ἀπάτη καὶ τέχνη* express in each case an effect and result. So, too, in *Frogs* 523 *ὅτιή σε παίζων Ἡρακλέα ἵνεσκεύασα. κατασκευάζω, make, render, so and so*, is common.

Ib. 89. *καὶ κατασκευαῖς ὅπλων καὶ χώρας καὶ προσόδων*.

Should not the first *καί* precede *ὅπλων* (perhaps *καὶ ὅπλων κατασκευαῖς*)?

Ib. 200. *ἀλλὰ δὴ τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας*.

This is taken to be an exclamation, but for an exclamation the form is very unusual. We should get the common genitive if we read *ἀλλὰ δῆτα τῆς ἐξουσίας*. *ἀλλὰ δῆτα* is certainly used in asking questions, and I do not know why it should not be used here in exclaiming.

Ib. 209. *ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶ μακρῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἀγώνων καὶ λόγων ἀρχή*.

Here too it would accord with usage if we read *πολλῶν καὶ μακρῶν* for *μακρῶν καὶ πολλῶν*. *πολλοί* regularly comes first in such a couple.

45. 86. In *ταῦθ' ἅπερ ἡμεῖς* write rather *ταῦθ' (like τὸ πρᾶγμα ταυτό just below)*, and so perhaps too in 54. 22 and 30 (the third *ταῦτα*). We ought to remember that the accentuation in such cases is entirely at our discretion, as it cannot possibly come from the author.

47. 73. *διομόσασθαι αὐτὸς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα οὐκ ἂν ἐτόλμησα*.

The accusatives have no construction whatever. Should we insert (say) *κελεύειν* after *γυναῖκα*, i.e. *κελεύειν ὁμόσαι* or *διομόσασθαι*?

58. 59. οὕτως ἔλαττον παρά τισι τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχύει <τῶν ἀποβησομένων ἀπὸ> τῆς παρρησίας?

LYSIAS.

2. 35. οὔσης καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας ἀπίστου καὶ τοῦ προσιόντος κινδύνου.

Is not some adjectival word lost, that went with *κινδύνου* as *ἀπίστου* go with *σωτηρίας*? We might think of *δεινοῦ* (*μεγάλου, τοσοῦτου*) τοῦ προσιόντος κινδύνου. Thalheim suggests *τοσοῦτου* in place of *καὶ τοῦ*, but this would not account for the *καί*.

Ib. 61. εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ κατῆλθον . . . <ἐν> καινοῖς κινδύνοις τὴν παλαιὰν ἀρετὴν τῶν προγόνων μιμησάμενοι?

The dative can hardly stand alone. 'By dangers' is not the same as 'by incurring dangers.' *κινδύνοις* quite possibly = *μάχαις*, but we should expect ἐν *μάχαις* here, not *μάχαις* simply.

6. 21. εἰσαχθεὶς εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἐδέησεν ἑαυτὸν τιμησάμενος δεσμοῦ.

For ἐδέησεν the ἔδησεν conjectured by Stephanus is usually substituted, but ἔδησεν ἑαυτόν is a very questionable phrase. I have thought of something like <ὀλίγου ἀπολλύναι> ἐδέησεν ἑαυτόν.

7. 6. For ἄλλως τε read ἄλλ' ὥς. When ἄλλ' ὥς καὶ became ἄλλως καί, it was natural for τε to be inserted.

Ib. 33. πάντες ἂν ὁμολογήσαιτε δικαίωτερον εἶναι τοῖς μεγάλοις χρῆσθαι τεκμηρίοις περὶ τῶν μεγάλων.

Dobree suggested *μικρῶν* for *μεγάλων*. That was certainly wrong, but I think *μικροῖς* should be written for *μεγάλοις*. The speaker has behaved properly on previous occasions ἐν *μικροῖς*, that is, as he explains in 32, in matters where he ran no danger or next to none. The present matter is great because the danger is very serious; but the court may infer the great from the small. *μεγάλοις* is the unintentional anticipation of a coming word.

12. 60. μισθωσάμενοι δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς πόλεως καὶ <ἄλλας τε> πόλεις ἐπάγοντες καὶ τελευτώντες Λακεδαιμονίους?

20. 12. εἰ δ' ἦν δημότης, οὐ δίκαιος διὰ τοῦτο βλάπτεσθαι ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ, εἰ μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε, ὅτι ὑμῶν ἔστι πολίτης.

The last words cannot be right, because the man in question was dead. I think now that we should read ὑμῶν ἔστι <τις> πολίτης, because so and so is a fellow-citizen of yours, an imaginary case. *τις* would easily disappear after *τι*.

Fragm. 1. 5. καὶ μοι ἀνάβητε τούτων μάρτυρες. Should not this be <οἱ> τούτων μάρτυρες?

Fragm. 271 (90). ἦν τις . . . <τὴν> τάξιν λίπη τῆς αἰδοῦς?

ANDOCIDES.

1. 25. πρὸς τούτοις ἐγὼ πιστότητος ὑμῶν ἕνεκα τάδε ποιήσω.

ὑμῶν is surely wrong. The *πιστότης* is that of Andocides himself, and the genitive ὑμῶν cannot mean *τοῦ* you. ὑμῖν seems required (cf. on Dem. Ol. 2. 30 above), and there is no difficulty about attaching the dative to a substantive. Cf. for instance Thuc. 5. 5. 1 περὶ φιλίας τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις.

ISOCRATES.

7. 14. ἔστι γὰρ ψυχὴ πόλεως οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ πολιτεία.

It is odd to assume that there is a

'soul of the state' and only declare that soul to be the constitution. What we seem to want and what would be natural to say is ἔστι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ ψυχὴ πόλεως πολιτεία or ἡ πολιτεία. Cf. Aristot. *Poet.* 6. 1450a 40 ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἶον ψυχὴ ὁ μῦθος τῆς τραγωδίας.

12. 40. (πόλεις) τὰς παραπλησίαν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἔχουσας καὶ περὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πράξεις γεγενημένας.

Is not παραπλησίαν out of its place? It might stand after καὶ or δύναμιν or ἔχουσας, but not where it does.

15. 28. Read <ἐξ> ὧν οὐδέν μοι πλέον γέγονε. Otherwise the genitive lacks construction.

1b. 141. ἐσκόπουν περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων ὥσπερ ἂν ὑμῶν ἕκαστος.

ὥνπερ will at once be more idiomatic and give αὐτῶν a point which it hardly has at present. Cf. on Dem. *de Cherson.* 14 above.

19. 43. οὐ μὲντ' ἂν μοι δοκῶ φυγεῖν οὐδὲ τὴν Θρασύλλου γνώμην.

He does not mean that he would not escape, but that he would not avoid or try to escape, Thrasyllus' judgment. Write therefore φεύγειν.

AESCHINES.

2 (end). τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦμὸν ἤδη παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ νόμος.

Is it really possible for παραδίδωσιν to stand thus before ἐγὼ? If we should not write παραδίδομεν, at any rate we might alter the order to something like τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦμὸν ἤδη καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ νόμος παραδίδωσιν ὑμῖν. In Isaeus 11. 10 παρεσκευάζοντο is now corrected to παρεσκευαζόμεθα.

3. 156. ὧν ἱερὰ καὶ τέκνα καὶ τάφους ἀπώλεσεν ἡ Δημοσθένους δωροδοκία.

τέκνα comes strangely between ἱερὰ and τάφους. Should it change places with τάφους or ἱερὰ?

H. RICHARDS.

THE NATIONALITY OF VERGIL.

1. IN Conington's *Vergil* (Ed. 5, I, xviii) we read: 'The name *Andes* is Keltic, and so apparently is *Vergilius*'; and in a note on the name *Vergilius*: '*Vergilius* and *Magius* were common names in Cisalpine Gaul.' The object of the following pages is to investigate these statements as fully as possible, and to attempt to estimate from Vergil's own names and those of his nearest relations the probability of his being of Keltic or some other determinable race. The method followed will be that of comparison with other proper names containing the same or similar stems from all parts of the Roman empire, collected from the indices, as far as they exist, to the volumes of the *C.I.L.* If, for example, we find that the name *Vergilius* occurs fairly frequently in other parts of Italy proper (*C.I.L.* IV, IX, X, and XIV),¹ we shall

be forced to conclude that though it may in one or two particular cases be a genuine Keltic name in Gallia Cisalpina (*C.I.L.* V²), yet the probabilities are against this, and we shall not be able to base any arguments merely on its occurrence in countries where the Kelts were settled. On the other hand, if *Vergilius* and cognate names occur but rarely in Italy and are common in the Keltic parts of the Roman

names found in *C.I.L.* VI (Rome) be used for purposes of comparison. In Rome, apart from the Latin population, we must expect to find foreigners from all parts of the Roman world. Livy (39, 3, 4) tells us that as early as 187 B.C. the Latin allies sent envoys to Rome, complaining that thousands of their citizens had migrated thither in order to avoid taxation in their native towns. An investigation was made, and Livy adds: *Hac conquisitione duodecim milia Latinorum domos redierunt, iam tum multitudine alienigenarum urbem onerante*. This intermingling of nationalities at Rome must have become still more complete under the empire, and it would be most unsafe to build any theories on the names of such a heterogeneous population.

² *C.I.L.* V also contains Venetia and Liguria.

¹ I have not consulted *C.I.L.* I, which contains the older Latin inscriptions arranged according to their dates; they are all found again in the other volumes of the *C.I.L.*, which are arranged geographically. Nor can the

empire,¹ we shall be able to conclude with a considerable degree of certainty that they are of Keltic origin and have merely assumed a Latin dress. Other names may be judged on the same principles, though it must never be forgotten that genuine Latin names occur very frequently in all parts of the empire, and absolute certainty can only be attained in a minority of cases.

2. The following are the names, collected from the different *Vitae*,² that we shall have to investigate: *P. Vergilius Maro*, the poet himself; *Vergilius* (cognomen *Maro*, *Stimichon*, or *Istimicon* ?), his father; *Magia* (*Maia*) *Polla*, his mother; *Silo* and *Flaccus*, his brothers; *Andes* or *Vicus Andicus*, his birthplace. Of these *Publius*, *Polla*, and *Flaccus* are common all over Italy. *Stimichon* and *Istimicon* occur in the *Vita Noricensis* and the *Vita Monacensis* respectively; these *Vitae* are of late date and abound in fantastic details, both biographical and philological. It is almost certain that the name *Stimichon*, of which *Istimicon* is merely a variant, has crept into them from *Eclogue* 5, 55: *Et ista iam pridem Stimichon laudavit carmina nobis*, and it therefore need not detain us longer. We will now consider the remaining names.

3. VERGILIUS occurs eight times in *C.I.L.* V. The figures for the other volumes are: IV 0, IX 10, X 11,

¹ *I.e.*, *C.I.L.* II (Spain), III (mainly the Danube Provinces, but also Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt), V (Gallia Cisalpina, Venetia, and Liguria), VII (Britain), XII (Gallia Narbonensis); *C.I.L.* XIII (the rest of France, Belgium, Holland, and the Rhine Provinces) has unfortunately not yet been provided with an index, and the large number of inscriptions it contains would have made the labour of collecting the Keltic names from them quite disproportionate to the scope of the present paper. It is possible that the conclusions arrived at in the following pages may have to be slightly revised when I have worked through *C.I.L.* XIII; but it is not probable that they will suffer any serious alteration. The volumes that deal with Italy are IV (Pompeii), IX (Calabria, Apulia, Samnium, Sabini, Picenum), X (Bruttium, Lucania, Campania, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica), XIV (Latium); *C.I.L.* XI (Etruria and Umbria) has, as yet, no index.

² E. Diehl, *Vitae Vergilianae* (Bonn, 1911).

XIV 11,³ II 9, III 6, VII 0, VIII (Africa) 1, XII 2, Brambach⁴ 0—*i.e.* omitting VIII and for the moment V also, we find 32 examples of *Vergilius* in 26,389⁵ inscriptions in Italy proper against 17 in 30,990 inscriptions in Keltic lands. Surely *Vergilius* cannot be called a common Keltic name! The proportion of 8 in 10,000 in North Italy is also very much smaller than that of 32 in 26,000 in the rest of Italy. Hence, on a mere numerical comparison, we must decide against the probability of *Vergilius* being Keltic. Only 2 examples in Narbonensis, only 6 in the Danube Provinces! Yet Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica*, p. 11, says: 'Nomen uix dubiae originis Gallicae. Radix uetust. cambr. *guerg* ("efficax") gl. Ox. extat etiam in uetusto nomine Vergobretus apud Caes.' Compound names containing the first element of *uergo-bretus*, e.g. **Vergomarus*, **Vergorix*, etc., may have existed, though we can no longer trace them, and from them may arise the short-name *Vergius* (Holder⁶ quotes *Οὐέρπιος* from Bordighera, *Inscr. Graecae* XIV 2276), from which *Vergilius* would be a perfectly correct derivative, cf. *Magius*, *Magilius*: *Magimarus*, *Magu-rix*; *Segius*, *Segilius*: *Segomarus*, *Sego-uesus*; *Matilius*: *Matomarus*; *Artilius*: *Arto-boduus*, etc. Furthermore, we must postulate a name *Vergius*, from which *Vergiacus* (3 place-names in France, see Holder) was derived. The Gallic name for the ocean, *Οὐεργίλος* and *Οὐεργιόνιος* (Ptol. 2, 2, 5 and elsewhere, see Holder) also appears to contain the same stem *uergo*-, 'efficax,' Ir. *ferg*, 'anger.' For other parallels see Hol-

³ It should be noted that six examples occur on one stone, so that for purposes of comparison it would, perhaps, be fairer to deduct about four.

⁴ *Corpus Inscriptionum Rhenanarum*.

⁵ The numbers of the inscriptions provided with indices are as follows: IV 7115 and 155 Tabulae Ceratae, IX 6419, X 8422, XIV 4278, II 6350, III 15,220, V (with Pais' Supplement) circ. 10,000, VII 1355, XII 6038, Brambach 2027. The *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, it is true, contains a number of additional inscriptions not yet incorporated in the *C.I.L.*, but the instances of the names in question in its indices are so rare that we may safely leave them aside.

⁶ *Altceltischer Sprachschatz*.

der. *Vergaius*, *Virgaio* (once each in *C.I.L.* III) are variants for the more common *Vercaius*, *Vircaio*¹ (cf. *Vercillus*, *Vercius*, etc., from compound names *Vercobius*, *Vercombogius*, and the like), and cannot be cited to support *Vergilius*.

4. Do the actual examples on the inscriptions help us at all towards any judgment? Of the 8 examples in *C.I.L.* V, 2 are from Aquileia, 2 from Verona, 2 from Hasta, 1 from Eporedia, and 1 from Calvisano (a village about thirty miles north-west of Mantua). The last is important: it is *C.I.L.* V 4137 and runs: *Matronabus Vergilia C. f. Vera pro Munatia T. f. Catulla u.s.l.m.* In addition to the Keltic name *Catulla*, we have a dedication to the Keltic deities, the *Matronae* (cf. Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures* 1886, p. 100 and Windisch, *Das Keltische Brittannien*, pp. 103 f.); it is tempting to conclude that *Vergilia C. f. Vera* was a Keltic woman, though that does not necessarily mean that her name was Keltic.² Yet it is evidence, even if slight, in favour of the Kelticity of the name. One of the examples from Verona must also be mentioned. It is *C.I.L.* V 3827 and occurs in 2 versions, as to which Mommsen concludes for sound reasons that one, namely that which he calls (*b*), which is first given by Jucundus (late fifteenth century), is a copy of that which he calls (*a*), and which is first given by Cyriacus (early fifteenth century). The versions of Cyriacus and Jucundus are as follows: (*a*) *M. Vergilio M. f. Anthioco* ('apud ripam fluuii Tartari³ in agro Veronensi'), (*b*) *P. Vergilio P. f. Pont. Max. Sabin.* ('in Ande Vergilii uilla, quae nunc dicitur Pietole'). Mommsen appends the following note: 'Cyriaci exemplum legitur in uita eius Scalamontiana; item in sylloge antiqua Veronensi apud

Felicianum, Marcanouam, Ferrarinum, Sanutum (inde Muratori e schedis Alex. Capponii). Diuersum exemplum uel potius titulus ad huiusce aliquot litteras mala fraude formatus legitur apud Iucundum et inde sine dubio apud Pacedianum, quamquam hic ait excepisse se a. 1517 Mantuae per aliquot dies moratum, Cholerum, Maccium, Grut. ex Verderii schedis (inde Orelli).' Upon the inscriptions found at Mantua Mommsen adds this introductory remark: 'Vicus Pietole Mantuae suburbani, quem Vergilii poetae natalem Andes siue Andicum uulgo opinantur opinabanturque iam aetate Dantis poetae, non tantum temere, sed certe falso, cum ex Probi testimonio constet Andes XXX m. p. a Mantua distare. The question whether these are two different inscriptions or merely two different copies of the same inscription cannot be decided with any certainty, owing to the disappearance of the original stone or stones. Mommsen adopts the latter alternative, and believes that the copy denoted as (*b*) is a corrupted version of (*a*), and that Jucundus' statement that it was found at Pietole is part of his corruption. In any case the inscription or inscriptions cannot refer to the poet Vergil, though the *Vergilius* mentioned in them may have belonged to the same family.

5. In the inscriptions of Italy proper (IV, IX, X, and XIV) we have three examples of *Vergilius* combined with the cognomen *Gallus*, IX 1085 (Ager Compisus): *M. Vergilius C. l. Gallus*,⁴

⁴ Possibly a Gallic slave, who took his Roman (?) master's name. If so, *Gallus* will not support *Vergilius'* claim to be Keltic. But why, if he is *C. l.*, did he take the praenomen *M*?

Vergilius Maro, the grammarian (cf. Teuffel, *Geschichte d. röm. Literatur*, 6th Ed., 1913, § 497, 7), should be mentioned here. He himself says that he was a Gaul, and it seems highly probable that his nomen was derived from a Gallic stem *uergo-*. It is strange that he should bear the cognomen *Maro*. It may conceivably be a real Keltic name and different from that of the poet Vergil (see under *Maro*). But it seems more natural to suppose that the grammarian *Vergilius*, and perhaps other *Vergilii* also, were given the cognomen *Maro* in honour of the poet Vergil. The fact that the grammarian *Vergilius* was called *Maro* cannot be adduced to support the Keltic claim to the poet Vergil's cognomen. It is also quite possible that the

¹ For the variation between *c* and *g* see Pedersen, *Vergl. Keltische Grammatik*, I 533. *Vercobretus* occurs, but the usual form is with a *g*. There are no examples of *Vercillus* for *Vergilius*.

² *Munatia* is not Keltic, though *Catulla* is. In the case of *Vergilia Vera* the cognomen is not Keltic, but the nomen may be.

³ The Tartarus at its nearest point is twelve miles from Pietole; cf. Jucundus' statement about (*b*).

X 4862 (Venafrum): *M. Vergilius M. f. Gallus Lusius*, X 5155 (Alvito prope Arpinum): *L. Vergilius M. f. *Galio* (? *Gallus*). Is *Gallus* merely an honorary cognomen in these cases, or does it really point to the nationality of the bearer of the name?

6. Before concluding we must hear yet another claim. May not *Vergilius* be Etruscan? W. Schulze,¹ p. 100, proves that *Verginna* and *Verginius* are of Etruscan origin, and adds: 'Verwandte mit *Verginna* ist der weitverbreitete Name *Vergilius*, in Etrurien C.I.L. XI 1785 (Volaterrae), 3248. 3254 (Sutrium), 3808 (Veii).' Vergil himself considered that the leading element of the population of Mantua was Etruscan;² his own cognomen, as we shall presently see, is very probably Etruscan, too.

7. To sum up then: *Vergilius* is found in most parts of the Roman empire, but especially frequently in Italy. There is a Keltic stem *uergo-*, from which *Vergilius* would be a correct Kelto-Latin formation. There is also a strong Etruscan claim to the name. We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that though *Vergilius* may be Keltic, the evidence favours a Latin or an Etruscan origin. At the same time it must not be forgotten that names of different nationalities quite frequently appear in identical forms.³ It would be quite possible to imagine a Keltic *Vergilius* and an Etrusco-Latin *Vergilius* existing side by side; but even so, the greater number of the examples would have to be attributed to the latter. Zeuss' statement should be modified accordingly.

8. MARO occurs six times in C.I.L. V. The other figures⁴ are IV 1, IX 2, X 1, XIV 6, II 6, III 5, VII 1 (*Maro*

or *Maronius*?), VIII o, XII o, Brambach o. The name is of comparatively frequent occurrence in Latium (XIV), though not found in either Praeneste or Tusculum, but does not occur in Africa, Narbonensis, or in the Rhine Provinces. Its absence from the two latter regions is strong evidence against its being of Keltic origin, even though all five instances in C.I.L. III are from the Danube Provinces. *Maro*, the poet's name, is always scanned with *ā*,⁵ and must be kept distinct from the Keltic names *Mārus*, *Mārio*,⁶ etc., from a stem *māro-*, 'great.' *Maro(n)* may be Greek; the form *Maron* must be, and where it is found in Italy, it must have been introduced from Greek sources. One of the Spartans who fell at Thermopylae was called *Māpaw*.⁷ A Thracian priest of Apollo, *Māpaw*, is mentioned by Homer, *Od.* ix 197.⁸ If there was a Thracian name *Māpaw*, some of the examples of *Maro* in C.I.L. III may be the same name in Latin form.

It seems clear, however, that the name came into Mantua from Etruscan sources.⁹ Schulze, p. 189, quotes *L. Maro C. f.* from Vettona as the equivalent of the Etruscan *maru*, and adds: 'Vollständig latinisiert lautet sie etwas anders, *Maronius*.' Corssen, *Sprache der Etr.*, I 237, truly says: 'Die etruskische Nominativform *maru* verhält sich zum lateinischen Zunamen *Maro* wie *etr. Caspu* zu *lat. Caspo*.' *Vergilius Maro* may, therefore, be an Etruscan name in both nomen and cognomen. According to Phocas' life of Vergil, l. 6, Vergil's father also bore the cognomen *Maro*: *Huic genitor figulus, Maro nomine*.

9. MAGIA (Vergil's mother). The name *Magius* occurs 54 times in C.I.L. V, mostly combined with Latin cognomina, occasionally with Greek, but

nomen of the grammarian and that of the poet were of different origin, the former Keltic and the latter perhaps Etrusco-Latin; it is even conceivable that the grammarian's nomen was not Keltic, but Latin, although he was a Kelt by race.

¹ *Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen*.

² *Aen.* 10, 198 ff., a passage now lucidly explained by A. Rosenberg, *Der Staat der alten Italiker*, p. 129 ff.

³ Cf. *Magius* below.

⁴ See footnote 1, p. 105.

⁵ The quantity of the *a* is not marked in the inscriptions in question. Of course, a Keltic cognomen *Māro* (gen. *Mārōnis*), from the stem *māro-*, is theoretically quite possible.

⁶ Also Etruscan, according to Schulze, p. 306.

⁷ See Pape-Benseler, *Griech. Wörterbuch*.

⁸ On this point Mr. Raper has built a suggestive, but somewhat imaginative series of conjectures in the *Classical Review*, 1913, p. 13 ff.

⁹ Cf. Rosenberg, p. 48.

rarely with Keltic.¹ The other figures² are: IV 2, IX 20, X 20, XIV 5, II 7, III 15, VII 1 (doubtful), VIII 1, XII 15, Brambach 1. Omitting V and VIII, we get 47 examples in 26,000 inscriptions in Italy proper against 39 in 31,000 in Keltic lands outside North Italy. The proportion of 55 in 10,000 in North Italy is far greater than anywhere else throughout the empire. Further, *Magius* occurs 9 times as a cognomen³ in *C.I.L.* V, in X once, and in II once. Another cognomen, *Magianus*, derived from *Magius*, occurs as follows: V 3, IV 0, IX 0, X 2, XIV 1, II 0, III 1, VII 0, XII 0. Again *C.I.L.* V has almost as many examples as all the other volumes. *Magiacus*⁴ occurs 4 times in V, once in XII. In North Italy itself, if we compare Gallia Cisalpina with the other districts, Venetia and Liguria, taken together, we obtain the following proportions: *Magius* (nomen) 39 : 16, (cognomen) 9 : 0, *Magianus* 3 : 0, *Magiacus* 4 : 0. The stem *magio-* is a good Keltic one (see Holder II 377); we find compounds *Maginarus*, *Magiomarus*, *Magiorix*, and short-names *Magio*, *Magilo*, *Magil(l)ius*,⁵ *Magissius*, and many others. We are perfectly justified in bringing *Magius*⁶ into line with these; it has every right to be considered Keltic. But at the same time its frequent occurrence in Italy proper warns us that Latin has a very good claim to the name also. Furthermore, according to Schulze, p. 184, it is not without close paral-

els in Etruria. Here, perhaps, we have the clue to its frequent occurrence in North Italy. Here it was that Romans, Kelts, and Etruscans first came into close contact with one another. What wonder, then, if a name common to all three peoples should thrive and flourish on soil that was populated by a mixed race consisting of these same three elements? But the task of separating the various *Magii* according to race will, if the foregoing suggestion be true, become a sheer impossibility. We must content ourselves with allowing the claims of Latin and Keltic, if not of Etruscan⁷ also, though in Gallia Cisalpina the preponderating element was without doubt Keltic, and the majority of examples of the name *Magius* are without doubt Keltic too. Possibly, if not probably, Vergil's mother was a Keltic woman. The name *Maia*, which occurs in the late *Vitae Monacensis* and *Noricensis*, is undoubtedly the same as *Magia*, the only form found in the earlier *Vitae*. We find the same disappearance of *g* between two vowels in later times elsewhere too, e.g. *Briantinus* for *Brigantinus*, *Briancio* (Briançon) for *Brigantio*, and Welsh shows the same change.⁸ Before leaving *Magius*, it is interesting to note that one example of its occurrence is at Casalpoglio, a village twenty-three miles north-west of Mantua, and that one example of *Vergilius* occurs only seven miles further off at Calvisano⁹ (quoted

¹ V 5105 (Inter Ollium et Sarium): *Magia Catulla*, 4990 (Riva): *Magius Magianus*, 6602 (Ager Novariensis): *P. Magius Messor*, 4483 (Brixia): *Magius Valerius Surio*, grandfather of *Primus Valerius Magirra*. In V 4642 (Brixia) we have a *L. Magius Primio*, husband of a Keltic woman, *Messia Atticilla*.

² See footnote 1, p. 105.

³ One example may be quoted, V 5713 (Ager Mediolanensis): *C. Atilius Mocetius* . . . *C. Atilio Magio fratri* . . . *et Surae Messoris f. Mocetius*, Sura, and Messor are Keltic names, and cf. *Magius Messor* in note 1 above.

⁴ V 5567 (Infra Lacum Verbanum): *Samaus Taeiei f. et Banuca Magiaci f. uxor*, 6957 (Taurini): *T. Mattius Ateuriti f. Magiacus*. Most of these names are clearly Keltic (see Holder for parallels).

⁵ *Magilius* is also found once in *C.I.L.* XIV.

⁶ Cf. *Vergilius*, *Vergius* : *uergo-* above, and the parallels quoted.

⁷ We cannot be sure that the Etruscan claims should be allowed in the case of *Magius*. It occurs in Etruria in both the Latin and the Etruscan forms. But in spite of this, it may well be purely Latin in all these examples.

⁸ See Pedersen, I 96 f. The form *Maia* may, however, be entirely due to mediaeval scribes, who very commonly substituted *i* for *g*. Professor W. B. Anderson has kindly given me parallels from Lucan, MS. Z (ninth century), 1, 166 *fuitur* for *fugitur*, 6, 431 *maiorum* for *magorum*. The latter example is almost exactly parallel to *Maia* for *Magia*. Professor R. S. Conway has also given me similar examples from Livy MSS. of the tenth and eleventh centuries (e.g., *iero* for *gero*). I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my deep gratitude to Professor Conway and Professor Anderson, both of whom have read my paper in MS. and offered many valuable suggestions.

⁹ Calvisano is thirty miles north-west of Mantua, a distance that corresponds exactly with Probus' 'xxx m. p. a Mantua distare'

above). However, it would be fanciful to dwell on this point longer. Tradition will, no doubt, continue to assign to Pietole the honour of being the birth-place of the greatest Roman poet.

10. SILO occurs 10 times in *C.I.L. V*. The figures for the other volumes¹ are: IV 1, IX 3, X 3, XIV 1, II 24, III 4 (1 in Pisidia, 2 in Noricum), VII 1 (doubtful), XII 3, Brambach 2. The name is evenly distributed, though it preponderates in Keltic lands. Holder, II 1549, claims it, though with some hesitation, as a Keltic name. Schulze, pp. 232, 274 note 3, suggests a possible, though doubtful, connection with Etruscan parallels. Perhaps we are here again dealing with homonyms of different nationality. There can be little doubt that a Keltic name *Silo* did exist. One example, *C.I.L. V* 4958 (Camunni), makes this quite clear. We read there: *Tresus Endubronis*² f. *Tiro arbitratu Endubronis patris et Silonis et Secundi fratrum t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussit)*. A strong point in favour of the view that it is Keltic is the fact that we find a form *Sila*, apparently serving as the feminine of *Silo*. *Sila* occurs twice in *C.I.L. V*, 3 times in II, i.e. we find the feminine *Sila* just in those two regions in which the masculine *Silo* is commonest. There can be no doubt about the Kelticity of *Sila*.³ We find the same parallelism (masculine -o, -io: feminine -a, -ia) in other Keltic names, e.g., *Gallio*: *Gallia*, *Mascellio*:⁴ *Mascellia* (*Gallio* and *Mascellio* are originally cognomina, which have been made to serve as nomina). In *C.I.L. II* 4069 *Sila* is the daughter of *Silo*. It must, however, be admitted that a cognomen *Silus* is found, though extremely rarely. Other parallels are *Silius*, *Silonius*, *Silonianus* (see Holder). Zeuss, *Gramm. Celt.*, p. 20, claims *Silo* as Keltic. Com-

(referring to Andes, the birthplace of Vergil). Pietole is barely three miles south-east of Mantua.

¹ See footnote 1, p. 105.

² *Endubro* is certainly Keltic (see Holder, I 1437).

³ Cf. V 5883 (Mediolanum): *T. Pomponius Valentinus* . . . *C. Pomponio Fido patri et Viriae Virocanti f. Silae matri*. *Viria* and *Virocanti* are indisputably Keltic.

⁴ The distribution of *Mascellio* proves it to be Keltic (see Holder under *Mascellio*).

plete certainty, however, cannot be attained in particular cases. We can only say that, judging by the distribution of the name and the parallelism between *Silo*: *Sila* both as regards stem and grammatical function, we must allow that a Keltic name *Silo* existed. In Gallia Cisalpina it is more likely to have been Keltic than Latin or Etruscan.⁵

11. ANDES (VICUS ANDICUS). Here at last we come to a name that can unhesitatingly be pronounced Keltic. Caesar mentions a tribe called *Andes* (short for *Andecavi*) in France, and there are countless other parallels⁶ (see Holder, I 139 ff.).

12. To sum up: the evidence must be considered somewhat unsatisfactory; we can arrive at no demonstrable conclusion. All we can say is that the preceding investigation suggests the probability that *Vergilius* and *Maro* are Etruscan or Etrusco-Latin, though the former may well be Keltic, whereas *Magia* and *Silo* would appear to be probably Keltic, though a Latin (perhaps Etruscan) claim might also be allowed. The name of Vergil's birthplace, however, if that may be cited as evidence of his nationality, is certainly Keltic.

13. This hypothesis of a blend of Etruscan and Keltic blood is strongly supported by the poetry of Vergil. He was proud of the Etruscan origin of Mantua,⁷ and had intimate knowledge of Etruscan character.⁸ It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine all the Keltic traits in Vergil's poetry. They are many, and are well summed up by Pichon⁹ in the following words: 'Celui qui a chanté la grandeur de

⁵ There is some evidence also of an Oscan stem *sil-*; the leader of the Marsi in the Social War was called *Q. Pompaedius Silo*, and there was a large forest in Bruttium called *Sila* (cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 12, 715), whence perhaps the cognomen *Silanus* was derived.

⁶ In *C.I.L. V* we find the following: *Andetiaca M.* f. *Galla*, *Andenius*, *Anderrudus*, *Andia*, *Andoblatio* (with *Atecingus* and *Demincia*), *Andovarto*; and in Pais, *Additamenta ad C.I.L. Vol. V*, *Andetius*, *Ando*.

⁷ *Aen.* 10, 200 ff.

⁸ E.g., *Mezentius* and *Arruns*; and cf. *Aen.* 11, 732 ff.

⁹ René Pichon, *Histoire de la Littérature Latine*, pp. 328, 329.

Rome n'est pas un Romain, pas même un Italien; c'est un Cisalpin, en qui apparaissent quelques traits du génie celtique: la tendresse intime, la rêverie mélancolique et vague, la sympathie pour tous les êtres animés, et comme un sentiment confus de la vie universelle, la curiosité inquiète de l'avenir mystérieux.¹ The question of the nationality of Vergil cannot be decided with absolute certainty, and we must perforce be content with probabilities. Yet the sentences from the Introduction to Conington's *Vergil* quoted above are, owing to their brevity, somewhat misleading, and leave the impression that we are able to pronounce upon Vergil's nationality with a greater degree of certainty than is really the case. A more accurate statement as regards the actual occurrence of the names in inscriptions would be: '*Vergilius* is found comparatively seldom, *Magius* with extraordinary frequency in Cisalpine Gaul.'

Since the preceding account of the evidence for and against the Keltic claims to Vergil's names and person was written, Professor Conway has kindly lent me a dissertation by Ioannes Zwicker, *De Vocabulis et Rebus Gallicis siue Transpadanis apud Vergilium*, Lipsiae, MCMV, which also contains a chapter on the nationality of Vergil. Zwicker has no hesitation in claiming him as a Kelt outright. He has, however, interpreted the evidence in a very partial spirit. For example, he quotes Diefenbach, *Origines Europaeae*, and Du Cange, *Glossarium med. et inf. Latin.*, for the existence of certain *Marones*, apparently a class of Alpine guides: '*Marones enim appellantur uia-rum praemonstratores.*' But merely be-

cause these *Marones* lived in the Alps, he rashly concludes that both they and their name can be nothing but Keltic. They may have been, it is true; but the evidence is entirely insufficient. Zwicker also gives a table of figures showing the frequency of occurrence of the names *Vergilius*, *Maro*, etc., in the different volumes of the *C.I.L.* Unfortunately this table is for various reasons practically useless; indeed, it is very misleading. *C.I.L.* I, which Zwicker includes, is a collection of inscriptions arranged chronologically; the other volumes of the *C.I.L.* are arranged geographically and contain practically all the inscriptions of *C.I.L.* I in their proper geographical environment. Zwicker does not note this, and hence quotes many examples twice over. Further, in using the Indices to the different volumes of the *C.I.L.* he is inaccurate, and not infrequently counts the occurrence of the same man's name in different parts of the same inscription or in different inscriptions as two or more distinct examples of the name in question. One glaring example of this kind of inaccuracy may be quoted. In the Index to *C.I.L.* XIV we find under the cognomen *Maro*: '*MARO* (*sic* 256; 259) *siue* *MARON* (*sic* 268; 903), 268; 125; 256; 259; 903; 2973.' Zwicker actually quotes 10 examples of *Maro* from *C.I.L.* XIV! It does not inspire us with confidence in the author, when we find *Verg*[] (the stone is broken) quoted as a certain instance of *Vergilius*. How does Zwicker know that it should not be restored *Verginius*? Accuracy is the essence of an investigation based upon numerical comparison. Unfortunately Zwicker has not set himself a high standard in this respect, and his work is in consequence seriously vitiated.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

The University of Manchester.

¹ Cf. also Sellar, *Vergil*, pp. 104, 105, and Slater, *The Poetry of Catullus*, pp. 26-28.

NOTES

ARISTOTLE, *DE MUNDO*, 399a, 7.

σελήνη μὲν γὰρ ἐν μηνὶ τὸν ἑαυτῆς διαπεραίνεται κύκλον, αὐξομένη (v.l. αὐξανόμενη) τε καὶ μειουμένη καὶ φθίνουσα. . . .

WE should expect the three participles in this sentence to refer to three different periods of the moon's monthly course. With the MSS. text this is not the case, for it is scarcely possible to differentiate between *μειουμένη* and *φθίνουσα* as waning and finally disappearing respectively.

It seems to me probable that *μειουμένη* is a corruption of *μεσουμένη*, which, again, may be a corruption of *μεσοῦσα*. It is natural to suppose that the writer had in mind the tripartite division of the month *μὴν ἰστάμενος, μὴν μεσῶν, μὴν φθίνων*. (Cf. also Theophr., *C. Pl.* ii. 4, 8. ἡλιον ἀνιόντα ἢ δυόμενον ἢ μεσοῦντα of the sun's daily course.)

The only evidence proper for the form *μεσοῦσθαι* is Suidas' notice *μεσοῦται· πληροῦται*. Dindorf and Hase, however, suggested (Steph. Lex. s.v. *μεσοῦν*) with considerable plausibility that *μεσοῦται* there should be *μεσοῦνται*. It may be pointed out, though, that while *μεσοῦσθαι* could not normally be equivalent to *πληροῦσθαι*, nevertheless ἢ *σελήνη μεσοῦται* would be equivalent to ἢ *σελήνη πληροῦται*.

If, however, *μεσοῦσθαι* is a *vox nihili*, I think we should read here *μεσοῦσα* and assume that this became first *μεσουμένη* and then *μειουμένη*. A corruption of *-ομένη . . . -οῦσα . . . -ουσα* into *-ομένη . . . ουμένη . . . -ουσα* is psychologically quite natural.

W. L. LORIMER.

The University, St. Andrews.

ARISTOPHANES, *AVES*, 488-498.

THERE is, I think, an allusion in this passage that has been missed by scholars. I take it that l. 492 needs no alteration. To whom Pisthetaerus is referring in *οἱ δ'* is left vague by Aristophanes,

the remark being in reality introduced to give Euelpides an opening. Euelpides at once cites himself as an example of these 'others' who 'put on their shoes and go abroad while it is still night.' (That it is himself he is citing as a case in point and not the *λωποδύτης* whom he fell in with, is clear from the fact that in his story it is he and not the *λωποδύτης* who was awakened by the cock. Pisthetaerus' *οἱ δ'* were clearly people who were fetched out of their beds by the cock.) His tale is, I believe, intended as a parody of the story told¹ by the informer Diocles, of which we have an account in Andocides i. 37 *sqq.* Andocides says nothing, it is true, about a cock, but even if—a thing we need not assume—Diocles did not say that he was wakened by a cock, the general similarity of the narratives—the narrator in each case getting up during the night through a mistake as to the time, going out of doors, setting out for the country and falling in with criminals—is sufficient to justify us in supposing that Euelpides' tale is intended to recall Diocles' story.

The allusion is a veiled one, but so are all Aristophanes' allusions to the Hermocope and its sequel. Probably Syracosius' decree, the reality of which Mr. Rogers has in vain impugned, was simply an order forbidding allusions to this subject.

W. L. LORIMER.

The University, St. Andrews.

NOTE ON THE PHRASE ΟΡΧΑΜΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΩΝ.

ὄρχαμος, ὄρχατος are plainly connected with *ὄρχος*, and the notion that the first derives from *ἄρχω* should be abandoned. *ὄρχος* is a line with intervals; in military language, extended order. It is generally, but not inevitably,

¹ Less than nine months before the production of the *Birds* (March, 414 B.C.).

ably, used of a line of trees, the Latin *quincunx*, and from this sense comes the secondary noun ὄρχατος, 'orchard.' But the verb ὀρχεῖσθαι, which is obviously formed from ὄρχος, would suggest another meaning for the primary noun and its derivative ὄρχαμος. The meaning of OPX-ος stands to that of XOP-ος—and the closely related χόρτος—as ὀρχεῖσθαι stands to χορεύειν. The latter verb with its noun is used of dancers arranged in close order in the ranks (cf. Lat. *cohors*, *hortus*): ὀρχεῖσθαι (and the meaning must be inherent in the noun from which it comes) is used of dancers in open order dancing independently. The dancer in a χόρος was one of a band; as ὄρχος or ὄρχαμος he had no one else to consider; he was 'premier sujet,' a Nijinsky or Mordkin. When the actor took the place of the solo dancer, the technical meaning of the word disappeared; but the champion who fought by himself in front of the line is his military equivalent, and ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν is 'first dancer of the company.'

As with so many technical words of music and the drama, the loss of meaning passed unnoticed, and the change is not so violent in Greek as it has been in English. 'Orchestral music' and 'choral music' should mean a 'pas seul' and a ballet: the history of the change is the history of the decadence of the dance.

F. A. WRIGHT.

Birkbeck College.

SOPHOCLES, *TRACHINIAE*, 331.

WHAT the poet actually wrote is so patent, as it seems to me, that one can but marvel at the many ineffectual attempts to mend the verse; but scholars here, as in so many other *loci conclamati*, have directed their efforts in the solution of the problem to the wrong part of the sentence: τοῖς οὖσι seemed to be so necessary to the thought that nobody suspected a 'corruptela.' These two words were originally one (οἴσουσι), which was read as οἷς οὖσι, and this naturally corrected to τοῖς οὖσι. That is the whole story.

Deianeira says: "Let her enter the house in silence,

μηδὲ πρὸς κακοῖς
οἴσουσι λύπην πρὸς γ' ἐμοῦ λύπην λάβῃ."

Cp. Andoc. 2. 8 ἐγὼ τοίνυν ἐκ τῶν παρόντων ταῦτα ἂ ἐμοὶ μὲν λύπας ἐπὶ χρόνον πλείστον οἴσειν ἔμελλεν, Aesch. Fr. 177 τί γὰρ καλὸν ζῆν βίον, ὅς λύπας φέρει;

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

SABINUS' EDITION OF PERSIUS.

THROUGH the kindness of the Archivist I had recently a sight of the famous Persius Codex in the Archivio di S. Pietro at Rome (B of editors), and can now answer the question put in Vol. XIX. p. 465 (note) of the *Classical Review*. The Sabinus 'subscription' comes from the hand of the corrector (who has, e.g., inserted the omitted line 5, 18 'cum capite . . . noris') and not from the hand of the scribe. The mere appearance of the ink makes the difference of the two hands unmistakable. Similarly in the Montpellier 'frater gemellus' (A) of this MS. neither of the Sabinus 'subscriptions' seemed to me to be written by the scribe of the text. If that is so, the statement of all the editors of Persius from Jahn to Leo that AB represent Sabinus' text is a blunder. Some copy (now lost) of the Sabinus' text was used by the corrector of A and the corrector of B, two MSS. which must surely have been written in the same scriptorium, and it is not the text but merely their corrections which preserve a trace of Sabinus' editorship.

Mr. Owen, the only editor who seems to have really examined the Persius MSS. (unfortunately not the Basilicanus), pronounced (*Classical Review*, XIX. 220) one of the two 'subscriptions' in A, the one at the beginning of the text, to come from the corrector's hand, but not the other which stands at the end, and immediately follows the choliambi (the only 'subscription' found in B). My examination of A was

so hasty that I would not venture to question his verdict, were it not for the notorious difficulty in assigning with certainty a line of majuscule to a minuscule hand. And how can we believe that there were two copies of Sabinus' text in the scriptorium, one transcribed and one used for correction? The presence of two 'subscriptions,' one at the beginning, the other at the end of a text, is, of course, a quite natural feature. We find it, for example, in Martial (see my *Ancient Editions of Martial*, Appendix B). In fact, we get from Martial's *Xenia* an instructive parallel. For the preliminary 'subscription' stands at the beginning, not quite of the book, but rather of the actual text, after the prefatory matter (*i.e.* after 'Epigram iii.'). It reads: EMENDAVI EGO TORQVATVS GENNADIVS IN FORO DIVI AVGVSTI MARTIS CONSVLATV VINCENTII ET FRAGVITII (?) VIRORVM CLARISSIMORVM, while the 'subscription' at the end of the *Xenia* is: EMENDAVI EGO TORQVATVS GENNADIVS CVM CAETERIS GENNADI VATIBVS. QVIRINE FLOREAS. I would conjecture:

(1) That the displacement of the choliambic preface is an accidental error peculiar to the archetype of AB.

(2) That the choliambic preface occupied its proper place in the Sabinus text and was followed (like the prefatory matter in Martial's *Xenia*) by the Sabinus 'subscription' assigned to the beginning of the text. This is the 'subscription' inserted by the corrector of A and the corrector of B.

(3) That the displacement of the preface was the reason why the other Sabinus 'subscription,' that assigned to the end of the text, has not been inserted at all by the corrector of B and is crowded into the margin 'alieno loco' by the corrector of A. When the correctors took the Sabinus' exemplar to help them in correcting the transcript of the other exemplar, they began their comparison of the two at the choliambi, the first item in the Sabinus exemplar, the last item in the other exemplar. They inserted the majuscule passage. When they ended the comparison, they found a very similar majuscule passage. The corrector of B thought the insertion of it superfluous; the more conscientious corrector of A managed with some awkwardness to find room for it elsewhere. To write it beside the other majuscule passage was clearly impossible.

W. M. LINDSAY.

St. Andrews.

REVIEWS

BLACK GLAZE POTTERY FROM RHITSONA IN BOEOTIA.

Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona in Boeotia. By PERCY N. URE, M.A. (University College, Reading; Studies in History and Archaeology.) 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 64, with 19 plates, photographic. Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford, 1913. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS learned and useful essay publishes another instalment of the results of excavation carried on by Professor R. M. Burrows and the author in 1907-8 on the site of Mykalessos in Boeotia.

NO. CCL. VOL. XXIX.

The graves in which this 'black glaze pottery' was found have been published already (*J.H.S.* 1909, *B.S.A.* 1909, 'Eφ. 'Αρχ. 1912), and the 'Corinthian' and 'Boeotian' fabrics from them have been discussed by Mr. Ure at some length. Now he gives us the 'black glaze kantharoi' of the sixth century B.C., and fifteen more graves, characterised by a series of 'black glaze drinking cups,' which he is led to assign to the fourth century; adding on pp. 58-61 an account of two inscriptions on stone from Rhitsona, some

fresh graffiti from the vases, and one painted maker's mark. The 'black-figured kylikes' for the most part still await their turn (p. 4, note), and there are more graves to come, from excavations in 1909.

The kantharoi, occurring in considerable numbers in the same graves as 'Boeotian' kylikes and the like, 'Corinthian' aryballoi, and 'black-figured' ware, are fairly accurately dated; though it does not seem quite certain that because there was only one skeleton (or not sufficient fragments to prove more than one) a grave had been only used once. Three and four hundred vases at one funeral seem more than ample equipment, and it would be arguing in a circle to say 'simply from the study of the pottery that each grave represents the vogue of some one definite moment' (p. 4), unless the fact of a single interment was independently established somehow. But the graves evidently cohere, and the total period which they represent is in any case not much more than half a century. The varieties of form and treatment which Mr. Ure discusses are therefore evidence rather of a multiplicity of concurrent types than of a long course of development; the two main types, deep and shallow, offering quite a number of interesting experiments and some curious hybrids. In view of what Mr. Ure says in another connexion (p. 33) about the significance of copious and jejune repertory, it looks as if these graves lay near to an active and spontaneous centre of manufacture, and as if this centre was still near the beginning of its productivity. Though he does not note them, Mr. Ure has probably taken into account the forms and the significance of kantharoi which appear on the coins of Haliartos and one or two other Boeotian cities, and at a later date on those of Mykalessos itself. They are the best evidence we have of the shapes of the metal kantharoi which so profoundly influenced the modelling of these clay ones.

It is a pity that fifth-century graves at Mykalessos have not been noted yet. Perhaps Mr. Ure's observations about the total lack of red-figured vases partly explain this (p. 36-38); villagers do not

always guide excavators to the most marketable tombs. In any case, there is at present a gap between the sixth-century tombs with kantharoi, and a fourth-century group characterised by other forms of black glaze ware. The significance of this copious fabric has been obscured by its lack of interest for 'collectors,' in which category we perforce include the great Museums and the 'learned' Societies which depend on showy finds for next year's income. The great opportunity, wholly missed, was in the necropolis of Marion in Cyprus (p. 34, note), and it would be interesting to test Mr. Ure's conclusions by the surviving tomb-groups in the Cyprus Museum. They certainly cover the period of the Mykalessian graves, and probably fill the fifth-century lacuna as well; for there were a fair number of tombs with red-figured vases, and some of the black glaze ware is of high quality. With the later kantharoi the Mykalessian coins already should be nearly contemporary, and there may be further evidence for date to be drawn from architectural and other non-ceramic palmettes.

Mr. Ure's treatment of these later graves is very careful and detailed, and his conclusions may be accepted as a contribution to a very ill-studied branch of Greek technology. But there is clearly much more to be done before we have the ceramic commentary on Boeotian federalism and on Boeotian relations with Macedon, which he forecasts so temptingly on pp. 2 and 39. For the late fifth century, too, the wholesale desertion of slaves (mainly industrial) from Athens, gains new significance if Boeotian potters were working so well and copiously just over the border. And such commentary can only be done by small persistent enterprises on second-class sites, and by microscopic commentary such as this. It is work, however, which can be done with small funds and a small staff; and it is just this kind of opportunity which the University College at Reading has been lucky enough to seize in publishing this monograph of its Professor of Classics.

Small queries and corrections befit so minute a study! Is there no English

for *Westabhang*, *dipinti*, *lacrymateria*? Should not Grainder (p. 39) be Graindor, and 'convex' (p. 30, about Pl. xi. 7) be 'concave'? And what is the chemistry

of the procedure on p. 19 for making pots red inside? One would expect the reverse effect.

JOHN L. MYRES.

THE BEGINNING OF LIFE.

Galenī qui fertur libellus EI ΖΩΙΩΝ ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΓΑΣΤΡΟΣ. Dissertatio inauguralis, etc., Sc. HERMANNUS WAGNER. Arnsbergiensis, Marpurgi Chatterum. MCMXIV. Typis Roberti Noske Bornensis.

WHEN by some strange emancipation, which is hard to explain, the vision of the Ionian sages was cleared of supernatural phantasy, and looked out over the world with imagination and reason unclouded, no function of nature was to them more marvellous, and none more perplexing, than *motion*. The stone which the philosopher threw into the air derived its impetus from his hand; but whence and how was generated the force which played through the animal body? And, as insight grew quicker and deeper, as behind massive motion a molecular activity, a universal swarming of atoms, was discerned, the more intense became the question of the source of this all-pervading and stupendous energy? It could not lie merely in nutrition, for, as Aristotle not unnaturally demurred, if so, trees would develop limbs and walk about.

The doctrine of the *pneuma*, in its origin, is almost mythological; even for the Stoic divinity was still a fiery and intelligent *pneuma* pervading the universe. In Ionian philosophy *pneuma* was a hypothetical entity, identified in the first instance with the respiratory function—the breath of life. And, if some aquatic animals did not breathe, well, it was truly observed that water contained air, and respiration was not only by lungs, but also, as was supposed even in man himself, by the skin. Thus, not unlike our modern hypothesis of the ether, the *pneuma* was the cause, source, or vehicle of all activity—molecular first and then massive. For readers of this Review it is needless to

qualify this general conception, this fundamental hypothesis, of the *pneuma*; or to trace the various kindred speculations of various philosophers through all possible conceptions of *pneuma*, as in its finest atoms *psyche*, in its coarser atoms *pepsis*, and so on; nor need we stop to consider the identity or analogy of *pneuma* with exhalation, with the air itself ('beseelte Luft'), with fire, or with a spirit near to fire—ideas which signified a passionate attempt of thought to seize the secret of oxygen, in those days impenetrable.

Until yesterday all thinkers regarded dynamics as a drama of entities: we have but just ceased—not quite ceased perhaps, to speak of electricity as a fluid: so, for early thinkers, heat and cold, weight and levity, and so on, were likewise entities; thus for Greek philosophers *pneuma* was an entity. But, in the animal for instance, how did it come there? Did it begin of itself, or was it bestowed upon the animal at a certain stage, and, if so, at what stage? Thus we find such treatises as this before us, the questioning of earnest men anxiously discussing at what stage *pneuma* enters the embryo—*πὼς ἐμφυχοῦται τὰ ἔμβρυα*; and books we find with such titles as this—*Is, and when is, the fruit of the womb endowed with this vital principle?* Is the *pneuma* or some quality of it, *σύμφυτον*, or is it altogether or in some measure *ἐπέσакτον*? When does the *ζῶον* become an *οὐσία ἐμφυχος αἰσθητική*? Does the potential substance become alive by the infusion of the semen? By doubts such as these the Church of Rome is disturbed to this day. As in this treatise (III. 24) it is held *τρέφεται μὲν γὰρ ψυχὴ πνεύματι*, it may well be asked when either begins?

The Dissertation before us contains a revised text of the treatise, with concise and (so far as I can tell) scholarly

notes, variorum and exegetic. In an Introduction the editor discusses the MSS. in a manner which seems to me careful and complete; but of his readings and conjectural emendations I am no sufficient judge.

I pass on to the enquiry if the treatise has been rightly attributed to Galen? The MSS. all assume this attribution, and Psellus was of this opinion. The Aldine editor, however, hesitated, and, following him, later editors, for the most part, have regarded the book as spurious. However, some recent commentators have sought to restore it to Galen. If from the hand of Galen himself, the tract would carry a certain authority; moreover, in this case, we could place it more exactly in its order in the history of knowledge. In any case, of course, an attempt has to be made to find such a place for it.

But the attribution to Galen cannot stand; the editor of the Dissertation repeats good reasons for the denial. The author, for instance, is something of a rhetorician—he appeals to hearers; Galen always wrote for readers. The composition appears to be one of the medical ‘Addresses’ which were frequently delivered by physicians of the period when entering upon a new office, or seeking election to office. Not a few of these are extant, one or two are in the Hippocratic corpus. We know, for instance, that such competitive addresses, by candidates for medical office, were held in Ephesus. (The editor refers on this point also to Keil J. Jhft. d. österr. arch. Inst. in Wien, Bd. viii., 1905.) Again, the address before us is more epideictic in style than was customary with Galen, who either argued

more carefully from facts or confessed his ignorance; whereas this author is often trivial, careless, and even absurd. Furthermore, he advocates opinions which we know not to have been those of Galen; in the matter before us he differs from Galen as to the moment of first animation. For Galen this was the *punctum saliens*, or first circulatory pulsation; for this author it was the moment of insemination. He also believed that the foetus in utero was nourished by its mouth, and breathed by its mouth.¹ Galen, on the contrary, gave these functions to the umbilical veins. Again, Galen was prone to quotation from himself; in this treatise there is no allusion to Galen. Finally, Galen avoided hiatus; this author does not: Galen used $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ after vowels, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\varsigma$ after consonants; the author of this treatise observes no such rule.

If we try to go beyond these negative tests, we find no evidence of the date, place, or quality of the author; as to the problems he discussed, they were commonplaces of controversy for many generations.

This Dissertation is a very creditable piece of work, and, so far as it goes, a valuable contribution towards the complete edition of Galen which is so much to be desired.

P.S.—The first volume of *Galen* in the series of the Academic Corpus Medicorum Graecorum has just reached us; we purpose to give some notice of it in a later number of the *Classical Review*.

CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

¹ Alcmaeon of Croton held this curious opinion, as did no less a person than Democritus, and so later Epicurus.

THE ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NEAR EAST, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS.

The Ancient History of the Near East, from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Salamis. By H. R. HALL, M.A., F.S.A. With 33 plates and 14 maps. Methuen.

I HAVE always felt a respect for the Oxford Greats man, and now I feel

something more like awe. This book, which I have had in my hands for some months—not indeed studying it continuously, but reading regularly as much as my mind could take in—is meant, as the author tells us, ‘mainly for the use of students in the school of Litterae Humaniores at Oxford, whose work

necessitates a competent general knowledge of the early history of the West-Oriental world, without which the history of Greece cannot be understood fully.' I took up the book with joy, hoping that even thus late in life, a second Cato, I might repair some of the disadvantages of my more rigid training. I read it also with a measure of joy, which soon quickened into the more salutary spirit of chastened awe. If the students in the school of Litt. Hum. can put away all this as a sort of savoury, before setting to at their square meal, in which Greek history is only one course, never talk to me of English degeneracy or soft options. The savoury includes archaic Egypt and archaic Greece, Egypt old, middle, and new, the Hyksos conquest and the empire, Babylonia, the Hittite Kingdom, Syria and Palestine, and the Medes and Persians. To this reader at least, it seems as though nothing can have been left out which can be of any importance; while the arrangement and the correlation of the parts make the material as clear as such a history can be. The author also seems to be judicious and not given to speculation; although to a Cambridge mind he gives a mild surprise when he accepts the fanciful theories built up on the 'double axe.'

Apart from the bare facts of history, names and dates, and the discussion of royal lists, which are given with care and lucidity, the book contains much that deserves the attention of students in other schools than the school of Litt. Hum. There is pottery, for one thing. We cannot get away from pottery in these days, and the imagination is struck by a history which takes us back to a time when the potter's wheel went not round, nor was his furnace kindled. What a genius was he who invented the potter's wheel! Pottery is one of the most important aids to dating, if due precautions be taken: and the student is properly directed to this. Then dress, again, hair fashions and headgear, the Cretan boot; burial customs; even in this condensed chronicle there is room for such topics as these. One might doubt however, if arguments can always be based on the absence of dress (p. 32); woad would not seem to our notions

enough for an inclement climate like England, if we argued from probabilities. The history of art is also full of surprises: well may Mr. Hall say that modern engineers could not do better than the builders of the Pyramids, three thousand years before Christ. What is said here about the various kinds of art is not much in proportion to the rest, but it whets the appetite. But most striking of all is the power of that one art which in those great nations, except Greece, was absent. Spells there are, and laws, letters and contracts, a few tales, and one really beautiful poem is given (p. 306), but how dead is the picture of ancient life as a whole! A few men stand out as great conquerors; but very few take on a human semblance, and they only by induction from their deeds. One such from the early period is Khasekhem (p. 111); another, less clear, Pepi II., who reigned ninety-four years—the longest reign in history. More is known of some later persons: Sargon, Khammurabi, Thothmes III.; Akhenaten, whom Mr. Hall unkindly calls the 'first prig' in history. But what shadows they all are at best! *Carent vate sacro*. When we come to Assyria, there is the Old Testament to help us. When all is said, however, the history of Greece seems to be all in daylight, these other countries in the dark. If the Egyptians had had the art of expression, we might have cared for many of them in our hearts as we care for Achilles and Hector—for surely Achilles and Hector were real men once, under whatever name they went, as real as that crabbed old Hesiod. But no litterae humaniores shed their light over Egypt, and for me at least her monuments may be magnificent, but do not touch the heart.

I fear this is a digression. It is no fault of Mr. Hall's if the Nearer East produced only one literature, and for his work no student can fail to be grateful. The student in the school of Litt. Hum. may (I only say may) take the book to Blackwell's when he gets his first, but I shall put it upon my shelf, and whenever I want to know anything about the Near East I will draw this covert first.

W. H. D. R.

NAZARETH AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity: A New View based upon Philological Evidence. By CHAMPLIN BURRAGE. 8vo. Pp. 68. Oxford and London: Humphrey Milford, 1914. 3s. 6d.

THE remainder of the title runs thus: *With critical appendices, including unnoticed pre-canonical readings; a discussion of the birthplace of Jesus, and the text of what is believed to be the hitherto undiscovered source of the prophecy, that the Messiah 'should be called a Nazarene.'* In the course of this short pamphlet (the body of the book, excluding appendices, only amounts to 19 pages), the Librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, has boldly tackled one of the hardest problems of all that confront the student of Christian origins—namely, the meaning of the terms *Ναζαρηνός* and *Ναζωπαίος*. The task is difficult, and requires a scholar who can add to the ordinary equipment a knowledge of Semitic languages and archaeology. If Mr. Burrage comes to the work with insufficient preparation, as in our opinion is the case, the courage of the attempt should yet be recognised, as also the stimulating character of much that he writes.

The problem may be briefly sketched as follows: As early as Acts xxiv. 5 the Christians were known as *Ναζωπαῖοι*. The author of Acts apparently uses *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός* and *Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωπαίος* as interchangeable terms, see Luke iv. 34 and xviii. 37. *Ναζωπαίος* cannot possibly be connected with Nazareth for linguistic reasons. No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the *ω* sound, which also occurs in the Jewish adjective *Nōsrī* applied to Christians. There are further difficulties connected with Nazareth, which throw grave doubt on its identification. What is meant by the reference to prophecy in Matt. ii. 23 is also disputed (*Ναζωπαίος κληθήσεται*). Most of the data come from Epiphanius in the fourth century. There are further factors which cannot be discussed here. When it is remembered that, with the exception of the

Gospels and a casual note in Acts, early Christian literature is silent on the subject of Galilee, and also that the most far-reaching change in the history of the Church, the migration from Galilee to Jerusalem, took place at a period which eludes our gaze, the fundamental importance of the issues involved will become evident.

Mr. Burrage's theory seems to be that *Ναζαρηνός* meant an inhabitant of Nazara or Nazareth, which was a district the other side of Jordan to which the Christians fled before A.D. 70 (the geographical proofs here are very slender), while *Ναζωπαίος* meant belonging to the Messiah (Hebrew *Nešer*—i.e., 'the Branch,' see Isa. xi. 1), and then by confusion the same as *Ναζαρηνός*. The spelling *Ναζωπαίος* in place of *Ναζωπαίος* was due to the influence of Judg. xiii. 5, *ναζειρ θεοῦ ἔσται τὸ παιδάριον*, as seen in Matt. ii. 23. This latter passage is the 'discovery' alluded to on the title-page. Mr. Burrage says on p. 41: 'No one seems to have noticed this point. . . . How these eminent critics and theologians' (i.e., apparently Epiphanius, Jerome, and Mr. F. C. Conybeare) 'could have missed this point it is difficult to understand.' However, the point is noted in Gressmann's Commentary on St. Matthew (1909, in Lietzmann's *Handbuch*) and presumably elsewhere. The marginal note to Matt. ii. 23 in a copy of the Authorised Version which has belonged to the reviewer for thirty years is 'see Judg. xiii. 5'!

Among the various objections that may be raised against Mr. Burrage's reconstructions the most serious perhaps are those connected with the transliteration into Greek of Semitic names. These have been treated at some length in long reviews of this book written by two well-known Syriac scholars, Professor Burkitt and Dom Connolly, in the *Review of Theology and Philosophy*, June, 1914, and the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1914, respectively. Reference may also be made to an article by Chr. Bugge

of Christiania in the *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1913, p. 145 ff., in which the author concludes that in early days the Christians were identified with the Nazoraeans, who in their turn were identical

with the *bürgerlich* type of Essenes—those, that is, who lived in the towns as a sort of Third Order as opposed to the desert-dwellers or Essenes proper.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

LATIN SYNTAX.

1. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. Von R. KÜHNER. Second edition. Vol. II.: *Satzlehre*, Part ii., neubearbeitet von C. STEGMANN. Pp. viii + 738. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1914. M. 16.50; bound, M. 18.50.
2. *Syntax of Early Latin*. By C. E. BENNETT. Vol. I.: *The Verb*. Pp. xx + 506 (1910). Vol. II.: *The Cases*. Pp. x + 409. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " × 6" (1914). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. \$4 each volume.

OF the new edition of Kühner it is not necessary to speak at length, because the work has already been described in this *Review*. The first volume (price 24s.), dealing with Formenlehre, etc., has not been well revised for the new edition, and cannot be recommended (see C.R. XXVI., 1912, pp. 200 ff.). The second volume, which treats of the Syntax, consists of two parts, of which the first (price 18s., 828 pp.) was noticed in C.R. XXVII., 1913, pp. 104 f., and the second is now before us. The reviser, C. Stegmann, has an intimate knowledge of Latin syntax (especially the syntax of Cicero and Caesar) and an extensive acquaintance with the recent literature of the subject. He has done his work well. I have compared the new edition with the old in a large number of sections, and have found again and again evidence of careful revision. Incorrect statements have been put right: *e.g.* Kühner says there is a Passive Future Subjunctive, *non dubito quin futurum sit ut laudare*; Stegmann rightly says that this is not Latin, and shows (p. 181) how the Romans expressed their meaning without such a periphrasis. The most recent texts have been used for the examples; in this second part Cicero's philosophical writings are cited from

Plasberg's edition, his speeches from the Oxford text. Above all, the information is fuller; so much so that the Syntax 'volume,' if we reckon its two parts together, has 400 pages more than in the old edition. The quotations and references are more numerous and more carefully selected. The passages quoted are generally sufficient if one wants to find quickly a good set of typical instances; if one wishes to go more fully into any subject the references are helpful; they often include a good hint such as cp. Madvig, *de Fin.*, or Lebreton's book on Cicero, which means that further evidence is collected in the place referred to. I have noted few misprints. On p. 406 the reference to Terrell's article (on *scripturum fuisse* as the regular oblique form of *scriberem*) should read *American Journal of Philology*, 1904, not 1894. In a book of this size the Index is all-important. I have tested it from time to time for some months, and have almost always found what I was in search of within a few minutes. As, besides the Index of Subjects, there is a very full Index of Latin words, the book will be useful to many who do not know German well. As a general reference book for Latin syntax from Plautus to Tacitus, and especially for the language of the time of Cicero and Augustus, it is and long will be the best of its kind.

For a fuller study of Early Latin the student will turn to Professor Bennett's handsome volumes.

Professor Bennett takes 100 B.C. as his later limit, and has 'endeavoured to consider all the remains of any syntactical significance from the earliest period down to this time.' 'Had I extended the scope of my work,' he continues, 'for another quarter of a

century, the additions would have been insignificant—merely a few citations from the Sullan annalists and contemporary inscriptions.' As a matter of fact, he would have included some of Cicero's early work, a very interesting addition, differing in kind from any of the literature here studied.

In the Preface to Vol. I. it is stated that the 'concluding portion of the work' will treat the Cases, the Adjectives, the Pronouns, and the Particles. In the Preface to Vol. II., which treats the Cases, nothing is said of any further instalment.

The most notable point about Professor Bennett's work is that he has aimed at making his record of examples a very full one. Unless he tells us to the contrary, either by putting 'e.g.' or 'frequent' before his examples, or by giving in parenthesis the number of occurrences, his quotations and references 'are intended to represent the complete material belonging under the given topic.' This completeness seems to me a great advantage, though there are a few places (for instance, II. 37-50, the 'Possessive Genitive' strictly so-called) where it has seemed doubtful whether a selection would not have been equally useful. But, as he says, 'it is impossible to foresee what particular information the student may seek in a syntactical manual.' The book will no doubt be used mainly for reference. In so using it one must be careful not to suppose that a set of examples is intended to be complete unless one has read the whole section in which they occur. It may happen that a statement to the effect that only a selection is given has been made some pages back. The writer thinks of his readers as going through the pages continuously: e.g. anyone in search of expressions like *Rhodo mercator* might be puzzled by the classification of the Ablative of Separation (II. 280). He would note, 'A. Uses with Verbs. B. With Adjectives and Adverbs,' and would be surprised not to find 'With Nouns.' Perhaps he would turn to 'D. Proper names designating place,' but he would not find his example here under 'Names of Islands.' If he persisted he would find the paragraph he

was in search of at the end of the section, printed without a heading, so that it seems to belong to 'Names of Rivers and Nations.' In some places where the evidence is apparently intended to be complete I have noted omissions: for instance, in I. 426, 'Present Infinitive with future force,' add *Asin.* 699, and, a very good example, *Most.* 633, *dic te daturum, ut abeat.* Th. *egon dicam dare?* II. 384, 'Ablative of Time within Which,' add *Bacch.* 422, *nego tibi hoc annis viginti fuisse primis copiae . . . pedem ut ecefferes aedibus.*

But the book is not merely a repertorium in which one can find, and generally find easily, abundant examples of any usage. The exposition is valuable and interesting. The author writes clearly and vigorously; he has read widely in grammatical literature and formed very definite opinions on the various questions involved; when there is any need he sets out fully and sometimes at considerable length the reasons in favour of the principle of classification which he adopts. A quotation may give some idea of the quality of his work:

'We cannot bear too closely in mind that, while the great mass of all syntactical constructions falls naturally into large groups of closely related uses, yet this condition was not original. At the outset there was greater variety and flexibility than later. With time the crystallisation into related groups of uses advanced further and further. Yet there always remained traces of the earlier freedom, many uses lying quite outside the clearly marked formal categories, others hovering between two related groups. This principle applies not only to the Genitive and other cases, but to the moods and tenses as well. To ignore it is to reverse the order of syntactical development, and to represent as primitive what was a matter of growth' (II. 11 f.).

That is well put. I hope I may not seem hypercritical if I raise objection to the author's occasional use, when there is no need of them, of German technical words in the midst of an English sentence: e.g. 'There was no "einheitlicher" Genitive in the *Ursprache*' (II. 10). And is it pedantic

to protest against the careless use of 'after' and 'with'? II. 294, 'The Ablative is the regular construction after comparatives in negative expressions.' (The examples show that 'before' would be rather more suitable: *hoc nemo doctior* shows the more usual order.) II. 199, 'Accusative of Inner Object with Neuter Pronouns': e.g. *si quid erro*. Why deprive 'with' of its sociative force? It is curious by the way that in a book devoted to the careful study of language, and especially of the cases, our own case-phrases should be used somewhat loosely.

Professor Bennett's explanations generally carry conviction. In one place he seems to me to adopt a very improbable account of the origin of a construction. II. 298 he says that the 'Ablative of Time after Which . . . seems to exist by implication in the omitted antecedent of the relative in such expressions as Ter. *And.* 104, *in diebus paucis quibus haec acta sunt*; Cic. R. A. 20, *quadriduo quo haec gesta sunt, res ad Chrysogonum deferuntur*.' This latter 'passage means "within four days from what time these things took place," i.e. *quo* is here equivalent to *ab eo tempore quo* (the antecedent of *quo* obviously cannot be *quadriduo*).' In the Terence passage and other similar passages he thinks we have 'a case of formal attraction merely. In strictness the correct form would have been: *paucis diebus quo*, i.e. *paucis diebus (ab eo tempore) quo*, but the analogy of *quadriduo quo* (which must represent the origin of our idiom) would naturally lead to a *paucis diebus quibus*, when the antecedent was plural. [Note that B. calls *diebus* the antecedent to *quibus*, which

is inconsistent with the statement about *quadriduo*.] In other words, the Romans themselves seem with time to have lost consciousness of the true nature of the idiom.' Is there not a more natural explanation, one which involves no such assumptions? The 'Ablative of Time within Which' is, as Professor Bennett says, 'a direct outgrowth of the Ablative of Time at Which.' They shade off into one another, so that *uno die* may mean 'on a single day' or 'in the course of a single day.' Hence such a sentence as *Diebus X, quibus materia coepta erat comportari, omni opere effecto exercitus traducitur* (Caes. B.G. IV. 18, 1) does not seem different in type from *Eodem die illum vidi quo te*. Compare the English 'I saw him in the course of the same day that I saw you' with 'In the course of the ten days in which the collection of the timber began the whole structure was finished, etc.' The meaning is not 'ten days after,' but 'not more than ten days after,' 'within the ten days.'

I have called attention to a few points in which the book might perhaps be improved in a second edition. But none of these is of any great importance. It will be useful, not only to those who are working specially at Early Latin, but also to those whose main interests are in the later literature. There are, of course, differences between the syntax of Plautus and that of Cicero, but the main features of the language are the same. It is a great satisfaction to have in English a work on this scale to which one can turn for evidence in case of doubt.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

St. Paul's School.

DE NUGIS CURIALIUM.

Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*.
Edited by MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES.
(Anecdota Oxoniensia). Oxford, 1914.

THE *editio princeps* of Map's book, *On the Trifling Pursuits of Courtiers*, was published in 1850 for the Camden Society by Thomas Wright from the only MS.

known—one of the late fourteenth century, which belonged to John Wells, a monk of Ramsey, known as an opponent of Wycliffe, and in his day Prior of the students at Gloucester Hall in Oxford. This MS. is now in the Bodleian Library. Sixty-four years later, the Provost of King's has presented us with

a new edition. The text is vastly improved; but it is disappointing that Dr. James should not have seen his way to giving us, out of his stores of legendary lore, a fuller commentary upon the contents.

Map borrowed the title of his book, but apparently nothing else, from the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury. He compiled it, as Dr. James shows (p. xxvii) between 1180 and 1194, and incorporated in it an earlier and much more widely popular work of his own, the *Epistle of Valerius, dissuading Ruffinus from Marriage*. Written in a somewhat difficult Latin, the *Distinctiones quinque de Nugis Curialium* are full of curious information; of legends, Welsh and other (Map lived near the Welsh border), and of interesting sidelights thrown on contemporary history from his personal experience. In the present review I shall mainly confine myself to observations on the text and on the use of older authors.

On p. 3 Dr. James's suggestion that *coruis* and *ceruis* should be transposed is supported not only by the medieval verses to which his note refers, but by the original passage in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii. 153. On p. 73 Dr. James notes that the MS. reads *brekeniaunc* for Brekeniaunc; but he does not mention that it also gives the last syllable of other Welsh names in the immediate context, *Wastiniaunc*, *Nagelauc*, and *Madaunc*—as *anc*. In a note on the margin of the Bodleian copy of Wright's edition, Dr. J. Gwenogvryn Evans conjectures that *Lenem* in the same passage should be *Levem*, and identifies (no doubt correctly) this *aqua uicina stagno Brekeniaunc* with the Llyfni river, which issues from Brecknock Mere and runs into the Wye. He would also read (I do not know on what grounds) *Uagelauc* for *Nagelauc*.

Dr. James has proposed a number of excellent emendations in the text of the MS. I should like to venture on a few additional suggestions of my own. I have in every case verified Dr. James's readings in the MS. On p. 26. 4, I would read *auarissime* for *amarissime*, on p. 87. 18 *uirgini* for *origini* (I cannot understand the sentence as it stands; the 'virgin' intended, if my emendation

be right, I should guess to be St. Catherine of Alexandria, *cuius ortu decorata gloriatur Graecia*, as the sequence in the Sarum missal says). P. 155. 4 (in the *Epistle to Valerius*, where the text of the Bodleian MS. can be checked by other MSS.) the reading given by Dr. James as that of DT, *humilis*, is surely right. Moreover, I should not wonder if this were the original reading of the Bodleian MS. The word as it stands has certainly been partially rewritten in much later ink. The marginal alternative to *sullimis*, which Dr. James reads (with a query) as *similis*, I cannot so interpret; I think it is *suilinus* (= *suillinus*), and I take it that this word (= piggish, unclean) was read instead of *sullimis* by those who read *mundus* (= pure) instead of *humilis*; it would thus be equivalent in sense to *incestus* in the preceding clause; but *humilis* and *sullimis* give a much better sense. On p. 159. 18 the sense clearly demands the omission of *et Filio*. On p. 242. 10 if Dr. James's correction *soluisset* for *soluit* be accepted, I should also read *alius* for *aliquis*. But the sense may be 'Perhaps there are kings who don't pay their just debts,' with a hit at an individual, possibly Richard I. (who seems to me far more likely than his father to be the *Appollonides* of p. 205. 4). On p. 243. 30, I should read *delictum* for *delicti*.

Dr. James has supplied in many cases the sources of direct quotations; to these may be added Ps. i. 4 for *Non sic impij, non sic* on p. 130. 16. No suggestion is made as to the reference to St. Gregory on p. 24. 10. If nothing nearer can be found, I would propose *Moral.* vii. 1, 2. Dacianus, on p. 46, is the magistrate under whom St. Vincent suffered martyrdom. The expression *homo nauci* (p. 92) Map had presumably come across in Priscian (I. 204). It is more difficult to guess whence he knew of the word *nefrendem* (p. 207. 19), his explanation of which (*adollescentem et virginem suam*) differs somewhat from that found in the passages of classical authors in which it is known to occur—none of them, moreover, likely to have been within his knowledge. With the quotation from the *Didache* on p. 146. 18 cp. Abelard, *Serm. de Eleemosyna* (ed. Cousin, i. p. 552). On p. 205. 7 the reference to

Virgil *Ecl.* viii. 10, might have been added.

One or two observations may be added, suggested by the few—the tantalizingly few—notes which Dr. James has given us. On 20. 27 Dr. James tells us that he has been unable to find in Richard Simon's *Novae observationes ad text. et verss. N.T.*, cap. 20, a passage to which Fabricius refers for a treatment of the quotation, *In quacunque hora ingemuerit peccator, saluus erit*. But Fabricius is merely referring to a remark of Simon's in the chapter in question to the effect that Lucifer of Cagliari (by whom, says Fabricius, the text is quoted and attributed to Ezekiel) often confirms the readings of the Codex Bezae. If Fabricius however is, as I suppose, referring to the passage of Lucifer quoted in the same note by Dr. James, he expresses himself badly. For Lucifer merely cites without naming the writers, first the old version of Isa. xxx. 15, and then Ezek. xxxiii. 12. Dr. James regards *In quacunque hora*, etc., as a reminiscence of the latter passage coloured by the former; I should have put it the other way round.

Dr. James's footnote to p. 61-7 is misleading. The objection to the Waldensian's saying, *Credimus in matrem Christi*, was surely not that 'the phrase was Nestorian,' but that it placed the Virgin Mary on a level with the Persons of the Trinity. On 157. 16 it would have been clearer to explain that in St. Jerome the treatise of Theophrastus on marriage is merely called *aureolus Theophrasti liber* (T.'s golden little book), whence Aureolus came by misunderstanding to be regarded as its proper name. On 177. 3 I imagine that (as, I gather from Dr. James' note, Liebrecht thought) *matre morphoseos* is merely a mistake for *metamorphoseos*, used as the rule of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*. I should be inclined to translate: 'taught by the "Metamorphoseos" (*sic*) he consents through a drug of his own administering to forget his usual way of life.' The MS., by the way, has *edoctus*, not *doctus*.

Haurit ex apotheca Scille furorem in the preceding line is a reference to Ovid, *Metam.* xiii. 967. On 207. 10 it is curious that Dr. James should not have noted that Map, in saying that Ethelred II. was called *consilium* 'quia nullius erat negotii,' as one who was always deliberating, and never acted, inverts the usual story that he was called *Unready*, because he lacked *rede* or counsel. In 242. 16 I feel sure that the MS. has *stammum* (as Wright read), and not *stancium*, as Dr. James thinks.

I have noticed three trifling misprints: 'frequentur' for 'frequent,' p. 24. 5; '1 Reg.' for '2 Reg.' in the marginal reference, p. 237. 9; 'III' for 'III8' in the reference to Fabricius on p. 263.

Resisting the temptation, as leading me beyond the sphere of the *Classical Review*, to dwell on the evidence supplied by Map that 'German militarism' was a familiar theme in the twelfth century, and that our pacifists would have found a sympathiser in Louis the Fat of France, if not in Map himself, I will end by calling attention to a curious observation of our author's on the spelling of *euangelium*. As is well known, this word was generally at that date written a double *u* in the first syllable; and Map remarks of the cynical verse, *Iupiter esse pium statuit quodcumque iuuaret: Hoc est zabuli* (i.e. Diaboli) *sic euangelium ab Euan, u consonante, quod est furor interpretatum* (unde *Bachus Euan dicitur*) *non Euuangelium Domini Ihesu, posito bis v. vocali, ab eu, quod est bonum, quod abstinentiam docet a malis et in bonis instanciam*. This attempt to distinguish two spellings as appropriate to a good and bad sense of the word is parallel with Hugh of St. Victor's attempt to distinguish *mathesis* and *matesis*, or John of Salisbury's to distinguish *máthesis* and *mathésis* on the same principle; see my note on John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*, i. 9.

C. C. J. WEBB.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

CICERO OF ARPINUM.

Cicero of Arpinum. By E. G. SIHLER,
Ph.D. Yale University Press, 1914.
10s. 6d.

PROFESSOR SIHLER describes his work as 'a contribution to the history of ancient civilisation and a guide to the study of Cicero's writings.' The first claim is somewhat ambitious, but the second, apart from some reservations, is well justified. The writer knows his Cicero well, and has read a large number of monographs. Also, what is more important, his judgment of Cicero's character is well balanced and sane. He rejects indignantly the caricatures of Dio Cassius, Drumann, and Mommsen, while he does not indulge in undue laudation. His industry is beyond reproach, and his enthusiasm for his subject is refreshing. As a catalogue of facts his work possesses high merit, though sometimes the facts are not well arranged. Thus on p. 273 he refers to the withdrawal of Appius to the opposite end of his province after the arrival of Cicero in Cilicia and his holding of assizes there. This he calls a curious form of double administration. The explanation, viz. that under a law of Sulla an outgoing governor had thirty days of grace, is not given until the next page. Sometimes the meaning is not clear. Thus on p. 15 we read 'Drusus then strove to deprive the equestrian class of that grossly abused monopoly' (the control of the *indicia*) 'by putting some three hundred of the most worthy Knights into the great council.' The reader will wonder how the transference of three hundred equites to the Senate could deprive the equestrian order of its privilege. Professor Sihler gives no explanatory note. It would have been well to indicate the difficulties in the statements of our authorities. Now and then Professor Sihler is a little behind the times. Thus (p. 344) he says that Cicero believed in the 'occasional' use of rhythm, but not in 'an endless sing-song of Gorgian mellifluence.' There are two ingredients in prose rhythm—viz. cadences (*numeri*) and balance

(*concinuitas*). Cicero employed *numeri* always, *concinuitas* on occasions only. The first of these was, as the ancients said, 'invented' by Thrasyarchus, the second corresponds to the σχήματα of Gorgias. The term 'mellifluous' is suitable for the metrical cadences of Thrasyarchus, not for the balanced antitheses of the Sicilian. It is somewhat surprising to find that Asconius is quoted from Orelli-Baiter (1845). If Professor Sihler does not know of Stangl (1912), has he not used Kiessling and Schöll (1875)? It is a moot point whether the Scholiasta Bobiensis drew from Asconius or not, but it seems odd to find in the text 'Asconius says' or 'Asconius thinks' (p. 172) when the statement is made by the Scholiast, not by Asconius.

These are small blemishes. There is, however, a feature of Professor Sihler's book against which it is necessary to protest, viz. its style. Frequently his sentences have no construction (e.g. p. 154).

'There were a few centuries which were pleased to cast their ballots without pay. A few. An awful indictment of the decadent republic so-called.' So (p. 258) 'Caesar's liberality to Quintus as due to Marcus. Of which there can be little doubt.' One is tempted to conjecture here *was* for *as*. The grammar leaves much to be desired, e.g. we find 'MSS.' used as a singular (pp. 72, 117, 328), and (p. 208) we are told that 'Politics makes strange bed-fellows.' Also (p. 446) we have 'you boy, that owest.' Professor Sihler is very fond of long words, e.g. (p. 18), 'Unfortunately for his germinating professional life-purposes no other courts were then held.' Here 'legal studies' would be shorter. On p. 409 we read, 'The Eschatology of his nobler aspirations, the indestructible residuum at the bottom of the cup of life, clusters around Plato's *Phaedo*, or the conclusion of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, his peroration here, a work much thumbed by him or nearly read to pieces.' Other passages are more colloquial, e.g. (p. 287) 'How busy men will be and how fuzzy about

such dribblets of factitious fame!’ or (p. 126) ‘a force and fervor, which came from Cicero with particular vim.’ ‘Doxographical bent’ (p. 386) is an odd phrase, also ‘clover-leaf’ in the sense of trio; thus (p. 343), the younger Quintus, Statius, and Philotimus are termed a ‘clover-leaf of disesteemed persons,’ and (p. 321) Q. Cassius, Antony, and Curio are called a ‘clover-leaf of servitors.’ The word ‘servitor’ occurs with monotonous regularity for all ordinary synonyms, *e.g.* supporter, adherent, follower.

The spelling is odd and inconsistent. We find Caesarian and Caesarean sometimes on the same page (*e.g.* pp. 319, 330), so Philistos, Theopompos, Ephoros on the same page with Timaeus. Brogitarus is shortened to Brogitar (p. 241). Cotyla (or Cotylo) is called Cotylas (p. 438), while Damassippus (p. 361) is a strange form. The tribune Quinctius (*Cic. Clu.* 103) appears as *Quinctus* (p. 109), while conversely Sextus Pompeius is always called Sextius Pompey. We are accustomed to speak of Marcus Antonius as Antony, but to use the full form of his brothers. Professor Sihler generally speaks of Lucius Antony, though sometimes of Lucius or Gaius Antonius. Sometimes he combines both methods, *e.g.* (p. 450)

Lucius Antony and Gaius Antonius occur on the same page.

The translations are somewhat bald, as may be judged from the following specimen (p. 49 = *Cic. Rosc. Am.* 134):

‘Decent ones (*i.e.* wine-parties) I dare say in such a residence, if this is to be rated a residence rather than a workshop of wickedness and a tavern of shameless deeds. His own flitting about the Forum, how ubiquitous it is, his head carefully gotten up by his hairdressers and perfumed with unguents, with a great number of retainers wearing the garb of Roman gentlemen, you see, gentlemen of the jury.’

The famous *mot* about Octavian, attributed to Cicero, *laudandum adolescentem, ornandum, tollendum*, is translated, ‘that young person must be praised, equipped, and manoeuvred beyond this plane.’ Perhaps ‘sent to another place’ would be a better rendering of the pun. The phrase *ad perpendicularum exigere, i.e. columnas*, is translated (p. 77) by ‘examine as to plumb.’ The meaning is ‘test by the plumb-line,’ *i.e.* see if they were quite straight.

It is unfortunate that a work which shows so much industry and is in many ways very useful is defaced by these blemishes.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

SHORT NOTICES

Some Greek and Roman Ideas of a Future Life. By CYRIL BAILEY. Pp. 24. Leeds and District Branch of the Classical Association. 1915.

MR. BAILEY’S contribution to his subject consists not so much in the material which he has been content to gather from familiar sources, as in the freshness of his emphasis. He moves towards the general mind—‘how little the mind of man has changed!’—and finds it not least expressive of itself in a Midland churchyard of to-day. In his lecture he called the attention of his hearers to the deep

currents of belief which swirl and eddy about the grave, and fetch up in distant places where they can still be forced to give up their secret. Religious tradition is a revelation not only of man but from man; and so far as comparative method defines and universalises this tradition, it contributes to a new theology. The other day I read in an inscription that Bishop Quodvuldeus (*sic*) made a building in honour of a martyr *iubente deo Cristo nostro*. But a Roman could restore a shrine of his gods *iussu deorum* and *pro salutem suam* (*sic*). It is not an accident, therefore, Mr. Bailey affirms, that religious tradi-

tion and the flower of immortality blossom from the same dust and ashes. When the reformers in Germany and Geneva stamped out, along with other usages, the popular prayers for the dead, they did not foresee that human beings who do not pray for the dead whom they loved would become careless about prayers for themselves. My real indebtedness, therefore, to Mr. Bailey (and to the Leeds and District Branch of the Classical Association for publishing his paper) is qualified by the pessimism of the Midland vicar (p. 1). 'I have no doubt,' he said, 'that the real religion of these people centres not in the Church but in the churchyard.'

FRANK GRANGER.

A School Atlas of Ancient History.

Thirty-three maps and plans, printed in colours, with plans of cities in black and white, and notes on historical geography. W. and K. Johnston, 1912. 2s. net.

THIS is the most useful School Atlas of Ancient History that we have seen. In addition to the political maps, there are physical maps, orographically coloured, and maps showing climate and vegetation. The historical notes (6 pp.) are full of valuable geographical and historical information, the printing is clear, and there is a complete Index.

G.

Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum.

By OTMAR SCHISSEL VON FLESCHENBERG. Pp. xx+110. Halle: Niemeyer. M.3.40.

THE author has written several volumes on this and kindred subjects, and clearly intends to carry on the investigations so magnificently opened by Rohde. He does not deal at all with the texts of the Greek novels; his interests are entirely literary: and although his theories as to the exact method in which they developed from one another are hardly likely to gain universal assent, his work claims the attention of all who take any interest in this difficult subject. The most obvious criticism on the book is that the various novels do not fit so exactly as he con-

tends into the various types which he enumerates (e.g. Heliodorus as a *neuplatonischer Tendenzroman*, Achilles Tatius as a *Moderoman*); but his analysis is always acute and skilful, and his criticism founded on a real and deep knowledge of his subject. The chapter in which he attempts a reconstruction of the Ninus-novel from the very fragmentary remains that have come down to us calls for special praise.

S. GASELEE.

THE ANCIENT TRADE-ROUTE TO INDIA.

Parthian Stations, by Isidore of Charoux.

By W. H. SCHOFF. Philadelphia:

Published by the Commercial Museum. 25 cents.

MR. SCHOFF, of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, who lately gave us a useful edition of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (C.R. xxvii. 210), has now treated in the same manner a Greek pamphlet whose title is given above. The pamphlet is only a record of names and distances, with a few details added now and then: as that 'they are always sacrificing' at Ecbatana, and 'an everlasting fire is kept up' at Asaac. Fragments of the same author are collected from Athenaeus, Pliny, and elsewhere. Notes are added to each place, where they can be identified, or the text illustrated from other sources, with quotations from travellers. Two maps are added: one of the trade-route, one of modern railways. The book is well compiled and deserves attention. I noted two misprints in the Greek (p. 4, l. 15, *σκοῖνοι, τῇ*); and it is difficult to see why *σταθμός* is several times translated 'stations.'

W. H. D. R.

Studi Storici per l'Antichità Classica, Vol. VI.

Edited by ETTORE PAIS. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 240. Pavia: Mattei and Co., 1913.

THIS volume will be chiefly interesting to students of the history of the last century of the Roman Republic. It contains a fresh instalment of Frac-

caro's studies on the Gracchan period, consisting in a collection of the fragments of the orators of that epoch, together with a running commentary. This will be found valuable on account of the fulness of its references to the sources, ancient and modern; we are glad to note that the author shows a thorough familiarity with the work of English scholars—Greenidge, Underhill (whose name, however, he almost always aspirates), Warde Fowler, etc. This article is followed by an essay by E. Ciaceri on the trials of Gabinius and Rabirius Postumus in B.C. 54. Without adding much to our knowledge, the author puts certain matters in fresh lights; he is, for example, inclined to take a more favourable view of Gabinius than that conventionally adopted by those who follow Cicero in all things. He accepts Dessau's arguments as proving that Rabirius Postumus is to be identified with the 'Curtius'

or 'Postumus' of Cicero's later correspondence, from which it follows that Rabirius secured a seat in the Senate and even had aspirations after the consulship under the Caesarian régime; and he rightly points out that this does not necessarily imply—what has been assumed in consequence—that Cicero's speech in his behalf secured a verdict in his favour, for the trial was not (strictly speaking) a criminal one, involving exile as the normal consequence of condemnation, but a suit for recovery of monies under the *quo ea pecunia pervenerit* clause of the *Lex Julia de Repetundis*.

Amongst the other contents of the volume mention may be made of Ettore Pais' article on Fundi, a cogent plea for the excavation of the site, and an examination of the names given to Western peoples in the Old Testament by Oberziner.

H. STUART-JONES.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I AM much obliged to Mr. Sloman for correcting my mistake as to the manuscript reading in Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. I am sorry that through pure carelessness I did him a slight injustice.

As to my appeal to Plautus I should like to say a few words. In our elementary books we naturally keep for the sake of simplicity and consistency to the Latin of a certain period. But it sometimes happens that we want a word or a form for which we cannot find evidence in the writers of that period. What is the best course to follow in such a case? Take, for instance, this interesting verb *edo*. It cannot be ignored, and yet, when we come to set out its forms, we cannot find authority for them all in the writers of the Golden Age. Some of the 'irregular' forms (*e.g. esse, est, esset*) occur quite frequently enough in prose and poetry of various kinds to show that they were in general use,

and we have no evidence that 'regular' forms such as *edere* were beginning to supplant them.¹ But it so happens that the Imperative does not occur. On the other hand, we can see from Plautus that *es* was the form in use in his day, and we have no reason to suppose that any change had taken place in the time of Cicero and Augustus. Are we then to tell beginners that we do not know the Classical Latin for 'eat that'? Or shall we give them the form which we know to have been in use a few generations earlier? We can at any rate be quite sure that Cicero and his friends would have understood it and accepted it as a Latin word, which is more than we can say of its rival *ede*.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

¹ See Professor Postgate's article "To eat" and "to drink" in Latin, (*C. R.* XVI. 1902, pp. 110-115).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

** * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- American Journal of Philology.* Edited by B. L. Gildersleeve. Vol. XXXVI. 1, No. 141. Pp. 1-124. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1915.
- Apulei Apologia* (sive Pro se de Magia Liber), with Introduction and Commentary by H. E. Butler and A. S. Owen. 8" × 5½". Pp. lxvi + 208. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Duckett* (E. S.) *Studies in Ennius.* Bryn Mawr College Monographs. Vol. xviii. Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1915. 9" × 6". Pp. 80.
- Edwards* (G. M.) *An English Greek Lexicon* (second edition). 8½" × 6½". Pp. xxxii + 338. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 9s. net.
- Einhard* (Life of Charlemagne). The Latin text, with notes. By H. W. Garrod and R. B. Mowat. 7½" × 5". Pp. lx + 82. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Euripides* (Alcestis). Translated into Rhyming Verse, with Explanatory Notes. By Gilbert Murray. 7¼" × 5". Pp. xvi + 82. London: Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1915. 1s. net.
- Pennell* (J.) *Pictures in the Land of Temples.* A series of lithographs, with notes by the artist. 9½" × 7". 40 plates. London: W. Heine-mann, 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Rolleston* (J. D.). *Lucian and Medicine.* 10" × 7". Pp. 24. London: J. Bale, Sons and Danielsson.
- Schoff* (W. H.) *Parthian Stations.* By Isidore of Charoux. An account of the overland trade route between the Levant and India in the first century, B.C. Greek text, with translation and commentary. Philadelphia: Published by the Commercial Museum, 1914. 9½" × 6". Pp. 50.
- Sophocles* (Electra). *Standard Flags for Amateur Performance.* By E. Fogerty. 7½" × 5½". Pp. xiv + 55. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1915. Paper, 6d. net; Costume edition, 2s. 6d. net.
- Tacitus* (Annals, Book IV.) Edited by G. M. Edwards. 7" × 4¾". Pp. xxvii + 144. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 3s. net.
- Theologisch Tijdschrift* (Afl. III.). Edited by B. D. Eerdmans. 9½" × 5¾". Pp. 177-260. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh, 1915.
- Viljoen* (H. G.) *Herodoti Fragmenta in Papyris Servata.* (Doctors' dissertation.) 9½" × 5¾". Pp. x + 60 + 8. Gröningen, Schol-tens, 1915.

The Classical Review

AUGUST, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

CLENARD AS AN EDUCATIONAL PIONEER.

III.

GREAT as may be the significance of Clenard in preferring to concentrate his attention on methods of teaching Hebrew and Greek, rather than on the attainment of the heights of erudition in the study of those languages, and in the editing of texts, we see most clearly the importance of his labours in the territory where he had the most competitors—viz., in the teaching of Latin. Clenard's methods were original in the sense that they were not consciously derived from others. They were the outcome of his own experience in teaching. In every generation we find that when teachers have ventured to put aside the traditional, the orthodox methods of teaching the classical languages, the dictates of simplicity and directness have driven them to oral methods,—more and more to approximate the teaching of a foreign language to the processes whereby we learn the vernacular language.

Though Clenard had been teaching private pupils Latin at Louvain for eleven years (1520-1531), it was only on leaving Louvain to go to Spain that he began to write from time to time about Latin-teaching. He was induced to leave Louvain by the son of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of the West Indies. Clenard himself thus tells the story:¹ 'About this time (1531) Fer-

nandus Colon (Columbus), to whose father we owe the discovery of the Indies, was occupying himself in Brabant. May peace and rest be to both of them. Ferdinand went through the whole of Europe with the purpose of devoting whatsoever memorable books which he could acquire to the establishment of a library.' This remarkable library was housed at Seville. Ferdinand sought in Italy and in the North of Europe, (where he visited not only the Low Countries, but also England,) all the books and MSS. which he could purchase, and enlisted such scholars as would be able to assist him in the project. Already Ferdinand had obtained the co-operation of the great Portuguese scholar and traveller, de Resende, and the latter suggested to Ferdinand that he should invite Clenard. Clenard accepted the offer for three years, the remuneration to be the equivalent of what he was earning at Louvain. At the same time Vasaeus of Bruges was also secured by Ferdinand for the same length of time.

The opportunity of going to Spain was hailed by Clenard, because for some time he had been drawn to the thought of the study of Arabic, partly through his keen linguistic bent, but still more from the desire to engage in, and promote, a *croisade pacifique* for a better understanding with, and eventually a conversion of, the Mahometans to Christianity. When the small party

¹ *Epistolae* (Plantin edition, 1566), p. 232.

of scholars led by Ferdinand Colon reached Salamanca, on the road for Seville, Clenard at once, without changing his clothes, went out into the streets of Salamanca and came to a great square, where some hundreds of University students were walking up and down, awaiting the opening of lecture courses. He remarked with gladness that his humble Brabançon costume provoked neither smiles nor raillery. Accosting one of the promenaders, he put him *au courant* with his projects, and asked him the name of the Professor of Arabic, for Clenard had been told, years before, that the University of Salamanca possessed such a Professor. Great was his dejection when he heard that the Chair of Arabic was a fiction! The University atmosphere, however, made Clenard impatient of proceeding to Seville, and Ferdinand—*egregius patronus*¹—released Clenard on generous conditions, and for two years Clenard lived at Salamanca by teaching, as he had done at Louvain. But he applied himself strenuously to Arabic studies. He then accepted a post at Evora, in Portugal, as tutor to the Prince Henry, and there he stayed, 1533 to 1537, continuing his Arabic studies. In 1537 Clenard was at Braga, and there he was consulted as to the foundation of a school. Clenard tells us he took the opportunity to offer to teach pupils in a public building, and readily received those who had not up to that time heard a word of Latin. At the hour named a great number of pupils assembled, attracted by the novelty, so that the building would not hold them all. All ages came; parents accompanied their children. 'Engaged as I was alone with this crude flock, of such varied minds, I used not the slightest word except Latin. So, by degrees, by assiduous practice, matters proceeded that, within a few months, they all reasonably well understood Latin, and even the least advanced could lisp out Latin one way or another (*utcumque Latine balbutirent*), though they did not yet know the alphabet. For I was drawing along their tender age, so that there should be no weariness, and I did

not interpret the word *ludus* in a sense opposed to its meaning, but in very truth we were "playing" in our school-lessons.'

Whilst Clenard thus accumulated experience in teaching Latin, at Louvain, at Salamanca, at Evora, and at Braga, both publicly and privately, his aim was ever towards simplification in methods of teaching. But he did not confine his teaching to school-lessons. He engaged in teaching *inter privatos parietes*. If any man deserves the title of experimentalist in education, it is Clenard. For adopting the custom of his times, he owned three slaves. But instead of reserving them entirely for menial offices, he kept them as constant pupils, on whom to try his methods of teaching Latin. He called them Michael Long-tooth, Antonius Blackamoor (Nigrinus), and Sebastian Charcoal (Carbo).

Clenard's account of his acquisition of his three slaves is as follows:² 'Never did I think that I should be a lord and master, yet now I possess three slaves. Listen to their names that you may have a good laugh—Michael Dento, Antonius Nigrinus, Sebastian Carbo. They are Ethiopians whom I thus teach, that they may some time be readers and writers for me. But if God should prolong my life, why should I not make of them theologians, so that they may rejoice in reading Isaiah, no less than the Aethiop baptized by the Apostle Philip? When I shall have four, what will hinder me from teaching them Chaldaic letters as happened to the four in Babylon? Others clad in purple take their delight in monkeys. But when I am wearied by studies, I delight myself with these monkeys endowed with reason. They learn Latin, willy-nilly, for they hear nothing else from me. The youngest cost me a little more than thirty ducats. If anyone offered me a hundred ducats I would not hand him over. I was able to train native servants, but when they should be instructed they would leave me. What I spend on these I spend on myself. If I should begin to get stupid by

² *Epistolae* (1566), p. 95. Letter from Clenard to Martinus à Vorda. Evora, January 10, 1537-8.

¹ *Epistolae* (1566), p. III.

reason of old age, I should have the slaves wise in my stead, so that least some of my wisdom will be retained.'

While Clenard was experimenting in his Latin teaching with the miscellaneous crowd of pupils at Braga, he introduced, so to say, an experiment within an experiment. He took the three slaves to the school and engaged them in Latin dialogues with himself before all the other pupils. The slaves were to listen to Clenard speaking Latin as they were accustomed at home, and answer in Latin, although often they might sin against the rules of Priscian.

'I conducted a conversation with them. The audience were most attentive, for they regarded it as a miracle that *Africans were speaking in Latin*.

'Heus, Dento," I say, "salta."

'Then he gave first one, then a second leap. The spectators laughed.

'Tu, Nigrine, repe nobis per pavementum."

'Without delay he acted the quadruped. All the onlookers, more than ever, roared with laughter.

'Carbo was ordered to run, and rushed along at once.

'So I went on, teaching many other things, not so much by explanation by voice as by gesture, so that by joking the words (vocabula) might slip into the minds of the boys. And my least care was that I should present to them grammatical rules at the beginning, for there is nothing pleasant in that method. But I applied all the art I could. In the same manner as merchants learn their idioms by practice, in various regions of the world, so in the crowd of those learning Latin, Latin words were hummed everywhere. In fact, it was to be counted a crime, in the early studies, to write the words; but with eyes intent on the teacher, their ears were accustomed to *hearing* the words. Whenever there offered itself either a sentence, within the limits of a few words, it was repeated throughout the school of disciples in gestures—e.g., the hand rubbing the hand—whilst I declared the name of the action whilst making the gesture. I made it my rule not to teach with any of the customary ostentation, nor to bring any fixed programme, but I talked about

whatever happened, just as the occasion prompted. If I caught sight of a noticeable nose, by laughing and touching my nose I gave the suggestion to Dento, who immediately blew his nose. Then I would order candles to be brought.

'Tu, Nigrine," I say, "blow out the candle." If he did it stupidly, so as to make an angry-looking face, I upbraided him. They soon understood what was meant by *candelam accendere*, and what by *candelam extinguere*. Hence we glided on to tallow and wax wicks, and other things which can be distinguished by the eyes (*oculis arbitrari poterant*), to use the phrase of Gellius. Whilst we are thus trifling, we seize hold as it were of the handle of discourse. Very often without any tedium, three hours pass away in our irrelevancy, with the greatest delight of the pupils.

'So it came to pass that boys could not be restrained by the parents from attendance at school, as if joyful to listen to the teacher, so that they arrive an hour before the time, and at night dream of nothing else than our school comedies. I with many others have often wondered at the great persistency of those who have been punished, yet by some mutual emulation yet constantly frequent the school that they may keep off ennui. Sir, let me tell you something new. When Easter approaches, and the great mass of people have not yet made an end of confession, it is announced that no one would be admitted to the school who has not made his confession of sins, and for that purpose we have named a portion of a day as a holiday from teaching, forthwith in all the churches there is a crowd to visit priests, lest they should miss the delight of entry to the school. The next day, indeed on that very day, many girls, wherever they saw me, came full of joy, and each, as she meets me, says: "Master, I have confessed," so full of alacrity, so pleased were they, to pass what time they could under the supervision of their teacher. The pupils were divided into certain divisions, which we arranged into more or less, according to the number of those present. And each one received a name and place, so that a tribune over

each should watch, with the least stir, deserters of their post, and except for a serious reason, scarcely any desertions were to be noted. I attached younger to the older pupils. And for the rest, sometimes one was a pupil, sometimes a teacher, so that by turns each one learned, and then taught.'

The school-teaching became a matter of town talk, and scraps of dialogue were repeated or sung, it would appear, somewhat like popular refrains from music-hall songs nowadays. Clenard gives an example:

Heus, puer !
 Quid est rei ?
 Quo properas ?
 Ad ludum literarium.
 Mane paulisper.
 Non possum.
 Quid ita ?
 Quia iam praeteriit hora.
 Quid tum postea ?
 Si moratus fuero, vapulabo.
 Ain verò ?
 Sic profectò.
 Utram metuis, ferulam an scuticam ?
 Utraque praeceptor utitur.
 Sed ausculta paucis.
 Non licet, inquam. Vale.

Clenard says that this dialogue was handed abroad in all the streets, so that handicraftsmen and mule-drivers constantly were calling out 'Heus, puer!' Girls also in the houses sang it. It was in all Braga. Soon Clenard sent forth another dialogue not 'endeavouring to be elegant in expression, but one which got hold of the boys.' Then followed another and yet another, always dealing with some subject not 'in any way removed from boys' interests.'

Clenard continues: 'And because by degrees Latin conversation became familiar, I began, step by step, to instil the taste for grammar. I hung up on the walls, in great characters, the declensions of nouns, which they took down into little books, tribe by tribe. This at least was done by those who could write, and they gave help to their neighbours both in transcribing and also in instructing pupils in the art of writing. This function also was intrusted to the tribunes, so that they should thoroughly give their attention to the more ignorant pupils.'

'In the meantime, knowledge of the

language grew in the learners, since, one by one, they answer back, now a sentence, now an adage, now some significant word, fixed in the memory. I ordered everything in such a way that no book, printed in type, was supplied to the school (in fact, it was forbidden). Yet in this great crowd, every day, each pupil had himself two special opportunities of reading, and also could gather by his ears what fell as a task to others. More definitely I will say: Tasks were not done in common; each had his own work, and therefore made use of his own powers, and heard others pronouncing what he would have to pronounce. The process is as follows: The tribunes stand up. Each in his turn goes through his task. The rest of the tribunes listen to the divisions, and with the greatest silence, even without wishing it, answer in their mind many questions asked from others.'

The two experiments detailed above, of the Braga school, and of the training of the slaves in the use of the Latin language, by no means complete the story of Clenard's efforts in the practice of his method of teaching. On Easter-eve 1535, i.e. nearly two years and a half before his teaching of the school at Braga, he wrote to Rutger Rescius, the Greek scholar-printer at Louvain:¹ 'I know,' he says, 'I ought to be thinking of divine things, at Easter-time. But I want to write to you about your little son. We have in the house of my host, the archdeacon, a boy of good brains, son of a French merchant, and great friend of the archdeacon. When I noticed the boy's ability, I said to his father: "Why doesn't Dionysius learn Latin?" His father only wanted him to learn the vernacular, and asked: "How can he be trained in Latin when the schoolmaster here (at Evora) himself does not even speak Latin?" "Let him come to me," I said. "Let him merely live with us, board with us, and he will become accustomed to Latin conversation. He will then speak Latin, why not? You were not taught Portuguese any other way than by practice in hearing and speaking it." "Yes, but Latin is another matter."

¹ *Epistolae* (1566), p. 96.

"Nay, certainly it is just the same with it. It was thus the Roman youths were taught it. What need of many words?" I order that every day he should come to me, and sleep at my house, and I would begin the subject by joking, rather than as if it were strenuous teaching. But you say: "Don't you teach the declensions and conjugations even to the smallest pupils? Tell me how teachers teach a Portuguese child Portuguese, before he knows a sentence of the language?" I provide a tiny little book and write in it now and again little sentences for the boy.

"Salve, domine. Ut vales? Bene? Ex animi sententia." This he read, and said again and again at breakfast, and recited it from time to time. Then he became accustomed, after saying "Salve domine," to my words, always in Latin, "Tu quoque, vales recte?" He hesitated what to reply, and although I could not tell him in the vernacular (not knowing it), I taught him by gesture to say: "Etiam, domine." On the next day, "Quomodo valet dominus archidiaconus? Fecit rem divinam? ubinam est? domi an in templis?" This he then continued to recite from his little book. Nay also, for the sake of a little fun, I threw in Greek words also: Πῶς ἔχεις ὦ φίλε; καλῶς. . . . Except such little digressions, he hears nothing but Latin with me, and if I talk with him for an hour, he understands everything well, and aptly speaks in reply. Yet for the rest of the time, at home, he hears nothing but the vernacular. What heights will your John not attain if compelled to converse always in Latin and not in the vernacular at home? Clenard then makes suggestions of further short dialogues, particularly advising Rescius that no long Latin sentences be used. He remembers that Rescius is a Greek scholar, and therefore thinks it worth while to say that Quintilian would not advise 'our John' to begin with Greek, simply because the child would not be in an atmosphere in which he would hear Greek spoken, as the Roman child might hear, in Quintilian's age, in favourable circumstances.

The more to impress the value of his method of Latin teaching, Clenard re-

lates the story of what has come under his observation, in the teaching of a four-year-old (*quadrimestris*) child by the child's father, who was a 'passable' Latinist. This father taught his child Latin 'not otherwise than the crowd of men is accustomed to teach the vernacular language. We regarded the results as a miracle. A year ago, in the presence of my prince, he recited parts from the second book of the *Aeneid*, with the description of Laocoon, and with so great an unction that the author himself could not have pronounced the verses more seriously. He said: "Validis ingentem viribus hastam," etc., so that I seemed to see the instrument trembling, so beautifully did he make the gestures. You would wonder also at his knowledge of genders and tenses, more like our pupils in their tenth year. . . . A few days ago he and his father were with us at breakfast, and, being bidden, greeted me with Latin sentences given him by me the day before. I send you the document itself, so that you may cherish good hope of your John, if only he makes due efforts in the practice of speaking rather than being sent to the hangmen—teachers of grammar.' He concludes by stating his personal preference for studies before the dawn of light in the morning rather than after the evening meal, and begs for a chatty letter in reply.

From Braga, Clenard proceeded to Granada, where he stayed some months, part of the time as the guest of Luis de Mendoza, Marquis of Mondajar, in the wonderful palace of the Alhambra. Here the longing grew more and more intense to get to know thoroughly the Koran, and Islamic writings, and to combat them in the interests of Christianity. At last the call came irresistibly to go now to Africa, get more proficient in Arabic speech, by practice, after the manner of his teaching of Latin to beginners, and to acquire Arabic books and MSS. Eventually, he thought of coming back to Europe, to Louvain, his *dulce Lovanium*, there to found a college for teaching Arabic and other Eastern languages, and to train missionaries for the conversion of the Musulmans.

On April 10, 1538, Clenard left Granada, and went to Gibraltar, and

accompanied by William, his Dutch servant, he crossed to Ceuta, and proceeded to Tetuan and Fez, although at this time there was war between Fez and Portugal. For four years he endeavoured to carry out his missionary enterprise, and his adventures are a part of that romance of scholarship which is too often overlooked. In 1542 he was back again in Granada—reduced to the utmost poverty—so as to part with the last of his faithful servants, Guillaume. He sickened and died September, 1542, before he could go back again to Africa. He had been utterly and basely neglected by Prince Henry of Portugal, his pupil. He was buried in the Alhambra; surely, few more worthy of the honour.

Clenard's struggles to learn Arabic and to teach the Mussulmans require an article to themselves. They are all in line with his keen linguistic studies in Greek and Hebrew, and his attitude towards Arabs in their language and Mahometans in their religion, may be described as distinctly pedagogic or educational.

Even in Fez, among the Arabs, he kept up his interest in the teaching of the classical languages. On August 21, 1541, he wrote to his old and faithful friend John Parvus, Bishop of St. James in Promontario: 'There is a man of ninety years of age who has become my pupil for Greek. Don't laugh, my lord Bishop. He is a boy of good hope after the proverb *δὲς παῖδες οἱ γέροντες*, and now almost knows the alphabet, except for the difficulties which arise for such old eyes in discriminating between *ν* and *υ*. Why, also, a Jew has been my disciple in Latin. It is something,

within the space of a year, to have taught the three languages at Fez.'

Clenard could not restrain himself, from time to time, in his letters to his friends, from noting down his method of Latin teaching. After his death a Luxemburg philologist, Nicolas Mameranus, brought together all his teaching-method passages from the *Epistolae* (Plantin edition, 1566), in 1576, with the title, *Nova Methodus docendi pueros analphabeticos, brevi omnino temporis spatio Latine loqui, praesertim intra privatos parietes. . . . Francofurti MDLXXVI.* [8vo., 61 pp.]. This is an interesting compilation. It does not contain the accounts of the pedagogical experiments described in this article, which of themselves sufficiently illustrate Clenard's teaching methods. But it includes a number of further examples of Clenard's Latin dialogues. Clenard himself wrote *Institutiones Grammaticae Latinae*, published at Braga, in 1538, and this book was re-edited and republished at Coimbra by Vasaeus, in 1546. It is extremely rare. I have not been able to see any copy, and it is not described in detail by M. Roersch.

Truly, Clenard was a new kind of missionary, one who took with him, wherever he went, the enthusiasm for Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and a simple-minded joy in perfecting a pedagogic linguistic method of teaching Latin to infants of four years of age, to men of ninety; and not only Christians, but also Jews and infidels—and slaves. When he died he was forty-eight years of age.

FOSTER WATSON.

Orpington, Kent.

ON A FRAGMENT OF COMEDY.

COM. *Fr. adesph.* 1324 (K.) = *Lyr. Fr. adesph.* 23 (Bergk ⁴).

δῆμος ἄστατον κακόν
καὶ θαλάσσην πάνθ' ὅμοιον ὑπ' ἀνέμου
ρίπιζεται
καὶ γαλῆν . . . πνεῦμα βραχὺ κορύσσεται
κἄν τις αἰτία γένηται τὸν πολίτην κατέπιεν.

The verses were called lyric by Bergk, tragic (perhaps Euripidean) by Herwerden, comic by Meineke, while Headlam considered them certainly comic on account of their metre. 'Mihi quidem comicum colorem habere non videntur.'—Kock.

We may be more near a decision if we can find out the true reading in verse 3. καὶ γαλῆνός is in all MSS. of

Dio. Then we have *ἐντ' ἡχώ πᾶν* M., *ἐντ' χώρα πᾶν* B., *ἐντ' ἡχῶν πᾶν* T., *ἐντ' ἡχωι πᾶν* U.

The ordinary reading due to Jacobs and Reiske, *ἂν τύχη, πρὸς . . .* does nothing to explain the corruption.

Now *κορύσσεται* is a word confined almost entirely to Epic. Though I find it used later of the sea (= *ρίπίζεται*, *κυκᾶται*) or river in Dion. Perieg. 201, Antiphil. A.P. IX. 277, Nonn. D. XXIII. 192, 204, Niket. Eug. IX. 29, Greg. Naz. II. 646 (Bened.), v. 308, yet its proper meaning seems to be simply *ἐπαίρω*, *μετεωρίζω*, Hom. Δ. 442 Eris. *ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη ἐπὶ δὲ χθονὶ βαίνει*—a passage which the author of the *Cypria* (fr. 1 K.) and Euripides (*Hec.* 114, *Hipp.* 1196) I fancy referred wrongly to a wave. Homer was thinking rather of the cloud no bigger than a man's hand, 1 (3) Kings xiii. 44, 5, [Theocr.] XXV. 93 *τόσα γὰρ τε μετὰ προτέροισι κυλίνδει ἰς ἀνέμου τὰ δέ τ' ἄλλα κορύσσεται αὖτις ἐπ' ἄλλοις*. Ap. Rhod. I. 1027 has it of the *ρίπη* *πυρὸς* falling on dry bushes, but it is elsewhere used of waves, Hom. Δ. 424, Φ. 306, I. 7 (*κορθύεται*), Ap. Rhod. II. 70, 322, IV. 214 (and so Dion. Perieg. 103, Quint. Sm. XIV. 344, Opp. Cyn. IV. 168).

It is probable that *βραχὺν κορύσσεται* goes together, 'rises to a slight height' in imitation of Homer (*l.c.*), and that either *πνεῦμα* means 'a ripple,' as perhaps in Dem. 328. 10—a wind on the face of the water—or that *κῦμα* should be read.

If we read *κῦμα*, the reading of cod. B becomes worthy of attention, since

ΠΝ ΧΩΡΑΚΤΜΑ

or the like could easily have given rise to ΠΑΝ ΠΙΝΕΤΜΑ.

εντεχωρα κ.τ.λ. now seem to arise simply from a misreading of *εντοσ*¹ *ωρας*, and this presumably because a scribe had before him an unfamiliar

adjective in *-εις, -εντοσ*. The first error was to read *αλένη ἔν τε χώρας*, while further corruptions arise from an attempt to patch sense and metre.

The form *γαληνήεις* (as *ἀνομβρήεις*, Nicander) I do not find, but like *κορύσσεται* it suggests the epic. What if our comic poet is parodying or borrowing (*e.g.* from Antimachus) some such phrase as :

ὀλίγον δὲ κορύσσεται ὥρας
κῦμα γαληνηέντος . . . ?

For that is what they say: Theophylact. Simocatt. Ep. 15 *ἡ δὲ θριξ ἡρέμα πῶς ὑπεκύμαινε τῇ οὐλότῃ καὶ κυανίζουσαν ὥρας γαληνῆς τὴν θάλατταν εἰκονίζετο*, though I do not find it used in the metaphor of the sea and the assembly. For *αἰτία, ἀγρία*² is probable if the parody continues; otherwise metre forbids. For the use of *ώρα* compare further Simonid fr. 12 *ὡς ὀπότεν χειμέριον κατὰ μῆνα τανύσση* (Blass for *πινύσκη*) *Ζεὺς ἄματα τέσσαρα καὶ δέκα λαθάνεμόν τέ μιν ὥραν καλέουσιν ἐπιχθόνιοι*.

Read then *καὶ γαληνη-εντος ὥρας κῦμα βραχὺν κορύσσεται κᾶν τις ἀγρία γένοιτο τὸν πολίτην κάππιεν*.

Finally, I would add one or two passages to those collected by Bergk (on our passage and on Solon fr. 12): Dem. 383. 5 (cited by Herwerden), Ar. Ran. 359, where *ἀνεγείρει*³ and *ρίπίζει* seem to me to refer to the winds and sea, Plut. Mor. 788c, Dio Chrys. I. 116 (R.), Aristid. II. 60, Dem. 328. 10, Cic. Muven. 17 (35), Prov. Cons. 16 (38), Milon. 2 (5), Planc. 4 (11), 6 (13), Philodem. Rhet. 12, Jo. Chrys. VIII. 44 (Migne). In the Byzantine orators the Emperor is the sea and his flatterers the winds.

A. D. KNOX.

King's College, Cambridge.

² Read *ἄγριος* for *αἴτιος* in Themist 12A.

³ Philo I. 695-6 M. Perhaps *ἀν γ' ἔρθησαν ἄελλαι* in Ap. Rhod. I. 1078. *ἐγείρω* is common. *ἐπεγείρω* in Solon, fr. 4. 19 *στάσιν ἐμφυλον πόλεμόν θ' εὖδοντ' ἐπεγείρει*, may be compared with *Fab. Aesop* 94 (Halm), *γαληνοὺς δεσπότης οἱ χαίρεκακοὶ παραφυσῶντες ἐπεγείρονσιν πρὸς ὁρμᾶς (ὁργάς?) καὶ ζάλας*. Johann, *Ev.* VI. 18 has *διεγείρω* of the sea.

¹ Compare *e.g.* Xen. *Cyrop.* VII. 5. 68, where for (*ἐπὶ*) ΧΩΡΑΚΕΙΗ almost all MSS. have ΕΧΩΡΑΙΕΙΗ.

AN ATTACK ON THE HELLESPONT IN 84 B.C.

(Rhetorica ad Herennium iv. 68).

WHILE we are taking so much fresh interest in the geography of the Hellespont, it may be as well to try and elucidate a corrupt passage which refers to operations there and in that district.

The author of the *Rhetorica*, whoever he was, at the end of his fourth book gives two examples of *brevitas* in oratory, in both of which the text is more or less corrupt. The first of the two I discussed at length so long ago as 1882 in the *Journal of Philology*, arguing that the person referred to in it was Marius and not Sulla, and suggesting that the date of that work may probably be 82 or 83 B.C. The first of these suggestions is now generally accepted. The second is also recognised as satisfactory, seeing that there is no mention in the *Rhetorica* of the work done by Sulla in or after the year 82. In 1894 F. Marx published his edition of the *Rhetorica*, and on p. 155 concludes that the work must have been written between the years 86 and 82, taking as the *terminus ex quo* the date of the seventh consulship of Marius. So also Schanz, *Gesch. der Röm. Literatur*, Vol. ii. (ed. 3), p. 467.

To this first example of *brevitas* I need not again refer. But I wish now to examine the second accurately, for I am inclined to think that it may enable us to make a more exact guess as to the date of the work. I am strongly inclined to think that it refers to the movements of Lucullus and his fleet in the spring of 84 B.C., co-operating with Sulla, and providing for the safe conduct of his army from Greece to the Hellespont.

In Marx's edition the text of this passage stands thus: 'Lemnum prae-teriens cepit, inde Thasi praesidium reliquit, post urbem Viminacium sustulit, inde pulsus in Hellespontum statim potitur Abydi.'

These few words, in spite of corruption (of which more directly), clearly indicate that someone with a fleet is watching the coast of Thrace, trying to guard it from a hostile fleet by securing the two islands Lemnos and Thasos which lie immediately off it, and having

as his ultimate objective the command of the Hellespont. And the words also strongly suggest that someone else is approaching along that coast of Thrace by the via Egnatia, for whom the naval commander is making his march safe.

Now early in 84 Sulla was advancing from Greece by the via Egnatia, and had commissioned Lucullus, who after various adventures had established himself with a fleet off the Troad¹ (say in Besika Bay), to clear the Aegean and the Hellespont of the forces of Mithridates. The situation is thus exactly that which is reflected in the words just quoted. Lucullus took Lemnos, we may guess, occupied Thasos, then did two other things which the corruption of the text unluckily leaves obscure, and finally, exactly as Appian tells the story,² returned to the Hellespont, and seized Abydos on the Asiatic side, so as to prevent Mithridates from establishing himself there. Abydos was just beyond what we now know so well as 'the Narrows,' and with that place in Roman hands, the Hellespont was also theirs and Sulla's march was secured. But there are here two textual difficulties about which I must now say a word.

The first of these lies in the word Viminacium, or Viminachium, as it appears in the best group of MSS. (M, for the value of which see Marx, *Prolegomena*, p. 20 f.) Under the Empire there was an important town of that name on the Danube, some 300 miles inland from the Hellespont or Thasos, and this name must have suggested itself to a copyist who could make nothing of the one in his MS. But Viminacium was unknown to the Romans of Marius' time, if indeed such a city existed then at all. 'Bithyniam' is the reading of three inferior MSS., but seems quite impossible. 'Lysimachiam' was suggested by Kayser (after Spengel)

¹ Plutarch *Lucullus*, ch. iii.

² *Mithridatica*, 56. Appian implies that Lucullus seized Abydos in advance of Sulla, in order to secure the passage of the Hellespont for his chief.

in his edition of 1854—i.e., the city on the narrow neck of the Thracian Chersonese, near the modern Gallipoli, and a key to the Hellespont. But this city, though the only one in those parts, so far as I can discover, whose name ends in *machia* or *acia*, can hardly be the one we want; the name is hard to reconcile with the MSS., and the town was too strong to be destroyed by a force landing from a fleet. *Sustulit*, in which all MSS. agree, must have this meaning here: (cp. 'Karthago tollenda' in iii. 2. 2 of this work); and Lysimachia did not meet with this fate, for it is mentioned by Strabo (vi. 54) without any reference to such a disaster. Further, if the reader will look again at the passage we are discussing, he will probably conclude that the town we are looking for was not on the Hellespont, but near Thasos—though not in the island, as is made clear by the words *praesidium reliquit*.

I am disposed to think that the missing town was some small one on or near the via Egnatia, and therefore of importance at the moment; one which might easily be destroyed, and of which the name was afterwards forgotten. But if any reader of this paper can make a better suggestion, I shall be only too glad to hear of it.

The second difficulty lies in the word *pulsus*, which might suggest that Lucullus had experienced a reverse imme-

diately after the destruction of the town, whatever it was, and had been compelled to retreat to his base. But *pulsus* is not in the MSS.; those of the group M have *sulsus*, all except C, which seems to stand by itself, and to give us occasionally the true reading. (See Marx, *Prolegomena*, p. 15 f.). C has *rursus*, which has suggested to me *reversus*, as I find it did to Baiter and Kayser for their edition of 1860. If we accept *reversus*, it will mean that Lucullus returned leisurely to the parts whence he had started to prepare the way for Sulla, and immediately seized Abydos, as we have seen. When Sulla arrived shortly afterwards, Lucullus took him safely across the Narrows, and the interview with Mithridates followed which brought a peace. So Plutarch tells us explicitly, perhaps from the memoirs of Sulla, at the beginning of the fourth chapter of his life at Lucullus.

These events happened in the spring of 84. If the author of the *Rhetorica* alludes to them, he had probably heard of them from someone serving in the fleet, and put them in at the very end of his work not long after they happened, perhaps the very next year. In any case we have here some ground for bringing down our *terminus ex quo* for the date of the *Rhetorica* to the year 84.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

NOTE ON CATULLUS, 84.

My attention has been called to the current interpretation of this epigram by a note on a specimen page of a selection of Latin verse, edited by the members of the Latin department of Williams' College. The note is as follows:

Quintilian (I, 5, 20) tells us that the early Romans rarely employed the aspirate, but said *aedos* for *haedos* and *ircos* for *hircos*. By the time of Catullus, largely owing to the influence of the Greek aspirated consonants, the use of aspirates was becoming common, so that, for example, *pulcros* became *pulchros*, and *triumpos*, *triumphos*. Confusion in the application of the principle

led to ridiculous mistakes, especially among the lower classes.

Arrius' pronunciation (*Chommoda dicebat*) seems well worthy of a note; for to this tendency in Catullus' day is due not merely our usual spelling of the Latin word *pulcer*, but the *h* in our English word *sepulchre*. The passage on aspiration in Quintilian, on which the foregoing note is based, runs as follows: 'Quamquam per aspirationem, sive adicitur vitiose, sive detrahitur, apud nos potest quaeri, an in scripto sit vitium? si H litera est, non nota. cuius quidem ratio mutata cum temporibus est saepius. Parcissime ea veteres usi etiam in vocalibus, cum

aedos ircosque dicebant. Diu deinde servatum, ne consonantibus aspiraretur, ut in *Graccis* et *trumpis*. Erupit brevi tempore nimius usus ut *choronae*, *chenturiones*, *praechones* adhuc quibusdam inscriptionibus maneat: qua de re Catulli nobile epigramma est. Inde durat ad nos usque *vehementer*, et *comprehendere*, et *mihi*: et *mehe* quoque pro *me* apud antiquos, tragoediarum praecipue scriptores, in veteribus libris invenimus' (Quint. I, 5, 19-21).

It is natural to suspect that so great a change as we find in the pronunciation of *choronae* for *coronae* or *chommoda* for *commoda* is due to a foreign influence. But it seems to me far more likely that the change was due to the corruption of these Latin words in the mouths of men of alien stock than to any alteration effected in the pronunciation of the Romans themselves by the influence of the Greek aspirated consonants. Surely in that event we should meet with χ for K in the Greek transliterations of names like *Caesar* and *Lucilius*. There is reason to believe that the tendency among the early Romans to neglect the aspiration did not pass away, but became more intense in the mouths of genuine Romans; and to this seems due the utter disappearance of the Latin *h* in the Romance languages. I remember that my old teacher, Studemund, who had spent much of his early life in Italy, used to tell us that the Roman of to-day is quite incapable of aspirating a vowel. It seems unlikely that the Roman of Quintilian's day heard anything in *mehe* but *mē*, or in *vehementer* but *vēmenter*. The *ehe* in these words seems merely a special form of Accius' device for representing the long vowel. Hence Quintilian's doubt: 'si H litera est, non nota.'

To me Catullus seems to indicate here with the indirectness, it is true, characteristic of the poet, but with a clearness intelligible to a man of his day, the real source of this change. Arrius, in his pronunciation of *chommoda*, was following the custom of his own people:

Credo, sic mater, sic Liber avunculus eius,
Sic maternus avus dixerat, atque avia.

You will notice that all the relations here mentioned are relations on the mother's side; and one of the marked differences between the Roman and the Etruscan in domestic relations was the attention paid by the latter to descent on the mother's side (see Pauly-Wissowa v. Etrusker, col. 754). In this way Catullus indicates Arrius as of Etruscan stock, and not, as is generally supposed, as a Roman *parvenu* of the lowest class. His uncle's name, Liber, will have nothing to do with servile origin, but will rather be due to his valour in dealing with *plenae pocula mensae*. This view seems to me to be strongly confirmed by the Florentine dialect of to-day, which pronounces *casa*, *hasa*, and speaks of the horse races as *i horsi dei havalli*. This is the exact result we should expect from the substitution of *chommoda* for *commoda*; the *ch* would certainly pass in time to the simple aspirate. That this tendency is not merely Florentine, but Tuscan, seems plain from Groeber's statement (*Gr. d. Rom. Phil.* I. 555) that *c* becomes *h* between vowels in the Tuscan dialect.

More difficult is the aspiration of the vowel in *hinsidias*, for I know of no such aspiration in modern Etruscan. But it is still more difficult to imagine that this resulted directly from Greek influence, and I know of no one who has suggested this. The pronunciation of *hinsidias* for *insidias* seems due to the same phonetic cause as that of *chommoda* for *commoda* in the pronunciation of a *media aspirata* like *ch*. Ellis and Sievers think we have merely 'a momentary energising of the following vowel'; and this seems to agree with Catullus' description of Arrius' pronunciation of *hinsidias*:

cum quantum poterat dixerat *hinsidias*.

The effort involved is disagreeable to many, as it was, for example, to Voltaire, who said: 'Je n'aime pas les *h* aspirées; cela fait mal à la poitrine; je suis pour l'euphonie: on disait autrefois *je hésite*, et à présent on dit *j'hésite*; on est fou d'*Henri IV.*, et non plus de *Henri IV.*' (v. Storm. *Englische Philologie*,² pp. 75 and 95). It seems to me probable that the aspiration in *hin-*

sidias, as well as that in *chommoda*, was an Etruscan habit, and that its disappearance in modern Tuscan is due to that same Roman influence which led to the disappearance of the Latin *h* in all Romance languages.

A further note seems needed to explain the *nuntius horribilis* mentioned in the conclusion of this epigram—for that is what Quintilian calls it. What is an epigram without a point? and surely the point of an epigram should come at the end of it? So the point of this epigram must be in the word *Hionios*. But this point, which was no no doubt obvious enough to a contemporary of Catullus, seems to require a word of explanation to-day. That the aspiration is in itself rough and harsh seems to have been clear to Catullus, for he says that after Arrius' departure to Syria all heard the same words pronounced softly and lightly (*leniter et leviter*). When he says that after Arrius' voyage to Greece the Ionian waves were no longer Ionian,

but Hionian, he probably means what we should mean if we said that 'Arry's tendency to aspire was so infectious that after his passage to Calais the waves of the Straits of Dover were even rougher than before. Such a bit of news would surely prove a *nuntius horribilis* to many an Englishman who had already experienced the power of these waves. The passage from Brundisium to Dyrrachium was to the Roman very much what the passage from Dover to Calais is to the Englishman, and the roughness of the Adriatic was proverbial. Of course the news that it had acquired a new roughness after Arrius' passage would be a *nuntius horribilis* to the Roman.

In conclusion, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to my old friend, Professor Keys, of University College, Toronto, for help given me with regard to modern Tuscan and Romance generally.

A. J. BELL.

Victoria College, Toronto.

NOTES

CASES OF CONFUSION BETWEEN ΟΥΔΕ ΤΙ AND ΟΥΔ' ΕΤΙ.

IN our manuscripts the collocation οὐδέ τι is often correct, but there can be little doubt that it has sometimes been written by mistake for οὐδ' ἐτι. Thus, in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 237, οὐδέ τι κίκυς | ἔσθ', οἷ' πάρος ἔσκειν ἐνὶ γραμptoῖσι μέλεσσιν, it seems better to read οὐδ' ἐτι, 'nor any longer,' which supplies the obvious contrast with πάρος, 'aforetime,' in the subsequent context. Cp. the *Hymn to Apollo*, 476 (298), τὸ πρὶν, ἀτὰρ νῦν οὐκ ἔθ'. Similarly, in the *Hymn to Demeter*, 306, I should prefer οὐδ' ἐτι γαῖα σπέρμ' ἀνίει, to οὐδέ τι γαῖα. In the *Hymn to Apollo*, 129, I observe that Baumeister, Goodwin, and Allen and Sikes rightly print οὐδ' ἐτι δεσμὰ σ' ἔρυκε, while οὐδέ τι is found in Gemoll's edition. (Here the evidence of the manuscripts is divided.)

Again, in Quintus Smyrnaeus, X 448, οὐδέ τί οἱ κάμε γυνία, I prefer

οὐδ' ἐτι, and the argument in favour of the same correction is still stronger, two lines below, οὐδέ τι θῆρας ἐδεΐδτε λαχνηέντας, where οὐδ' ἐτι is clearly confirmed by the following phrase: πάρος μέγα πεφρικυῖα.

J. E. SANDYS.

Cambridge.

A CORRECTION OF ISIDORE, VIII xi § 83.

DR. L. C. PURSER, in the course of a review of Professor Lindsay's *Isidore*, in *Hermathena*, No xxviii (1912), p. 188, suggests that, in the corrupt passage on Pan, in VIII xi § 83 'villosus est, quia tellus convestita est tagitventibus†, we should perhaps read *vegetantibus*, 'with growing things,' lit. life-giving things; cp. § 61, 'dicunt etiam eam (i.e. Cererem id est terram). . . Vestam quod *herbis* vel variis *vestita* sit rebus.' Dr. Purser adds that he 'can offer no parallel' for this use of *vegetantibus*. It is therefore worth while to suggest that

the true reading is *gignentibus*, explained in the dictionaries as 'things that grow, as plants, etc.' For this use there are two parallels in the *Jugurtha* of Sallust, 79, 6 '*loca nuda gignentium*,' and 93, 4, and another in Lactantius, *De ira Dei*, i 13, where *gignentia* is contrasted with *animalia*.

J. E. SANDYS.

Cambridge.

THE ACTIVE CONSTRUCTION KEPT WITH PASSIVE VERBS.

PHRASES like *perculsi pectora Poeni*, to take a simple specimen, seem to me to have been wrongly analysed. They are found both in Greek and in Latin; and it does not matter whether the Latin practice is 'of Greek suggestion,' as Roby *L.G.* 1127 thinks, or not. The number of Latin examples, from Ennius onwards, makes it unlikely that they are a foreign idiom, and I am about to suggest that they are due to a wider principle of language.

By a natural economy of effort, phrases are changed as little as possible when they have to be changed at all. Hence, for example, we say not only 'Let me make A and B friends,' 'A and B made friends,' but also 'A made friends with B': e.g. Shakespeare, *L.L.L.* V. ii. 13 'You'll never be friends with him,' *M.V.* I. iii. 139 'I would be friends with you,' etc. So also 'I gave him to understand,' and 'He was given to understand' (Shakespeare, *M.V.* II. viii. 7); 'I gave him a book' and 'He was given a book'; 'To guard against a danger' and 'The danger must be guarded against': colloquially one would not be shocked to hear 'I was shaken hands with.'

If we examine the sentence, 'He was given a book,' we see that the active has been made passive in a slightly unusual way. The normal passive would be, 'A book was given to him'; but there are two nouns in this type, and instead of the direct object becoming subject, the other noun (here a pronoun) becomes subject, the object remaining as it was. The change of form is greater in the usual passive type, and I believe that was the reason here for the unusual type.

Now apply this to the classical examples, and see how they all show this type:

Active.	Passive: (1) usual, (2) this type.
1. Volucrum corda tua vi percellis.	(1) Volucrum corda tua vi perculsa. (2) Volucres percussae corda tua vi.
2. Unum pedem ex- uit vinclis.	(1) Unus pes ab ea exutus vinclis. (2) Unum exuta pedem vinclis.
3. Inscritbit nomina regum floribus.	(1) Inscripta nomina regum floribus. (2) Inscripti nomina regum flores.
4. Per pedes Hectori traicit lora tumen- tes.	(1) Per pedes Hectori traiecta lora tu- mentes. (2) Per pedes traiectus lora tumentes Hector.
5. Delphinum caudas luporum utero pistrici committo.	(1) Delphinum caudae luporum utero pis- trici commisse. (2) Pistris delphinum caudas utero com- missa luporum.
6. Pueri laevo sus- pendunt loculos lacerto.	(1) Puerorum laevo sus- pensi loculi la- certo. (2) Pueri laevo sus- pensi loculos ta- bulamquelacerto.
7. Filii chlamydem acu pingo.	(1) Filii chlamys acu picta. (2) Filius pictus acu chlamydem.

If a reference to the Greek middle voice could be accepted as explaining some of the Latin constructions (Roby 1126), it will hardly apply to this unfortunate *lad pictus acu*, or to the school-boys *suspensi lacerto*, or to Hector; but I submit that we want an explanation that will fit all the facts. This which I offer does fit them, and is equally applicable to Greek (as Herod. vii. 77 *αἰχμὰς τε βραχέας εἶχον καὶ εἴματα ἐνπεπορπέατο*), or English, or other languages. Grammatically, the phrases are incorrect, like *ante diem quintum Kalendas*, and many another idiom; they can only be understood by reference to the normal active form. Originally due to a desire to change as little as possible, they became common, and then the poets, Virgil in particular, used the type as an elegance.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

REVIEWS

BURNET'S GREEK PHILOSOPHY.

Greek Philosophy: Part I., Thales to Plato. By JOHN BURNET. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 10s. net.

THIS is a book of first-rate importance. In the course of 350 pages Professor Burnet provides his readers with a succinct account of the progress of Greek philosophy up to and including the final development of the Platonic system. It is not so much a general history of the various philosophical schools aiming at the inclusion of all the chief points of doctrine, as a summary appreciation of what each thinker contributed to the common stock. It is probably superfluous to commend the author's complete control of his material, his thorough independence of judgement, and the admirable clearness of style whereby, notwithstanding the obscurity of much of the subject-matter, he never allows us to miss the track of his argument.

The volume is divided into three Books. The first deals with the pre-Socratics ending with Leucippus, the second with the Sophists, Socrates, and Democritus, and the third, which is half as long again as either of the others, with Plato. It is unnecessary to speak of the first Book, which is mainly a *résumé* of the 1908 edition of *Early Greek Philosophy*. On the other hand, Book III. is entirely new, and will be eagerly read; though it should be observed that the author apologizes in his Preface for being obliged to state conclusions without discussing their grounds, and hopes to remedy the defect on another occasion. The greater part consists of an analytical exposition of the philosophical results obtained in the dialogues *Theaetetus*, *Parmenides*, *Sophist*, *Politicus*, *Laws*, *Philebus*, and *Timaeus*. The enumeration is enough to show that Professor Burnet is in sympathy with the movement pioneered by Professor Henry Jackson, which sought to vindicate the importance of the later dialogues as the ultimate expression of Platonism. He is

accordingly obliged to meet the inevitable difficulty arising out of the inconsistency of their doctrine with the ideal system expounded in the *Phaedo* and *Republic*. To put it briefly, what are we to make of the criticism of the *Parmenides* and of the ontology of the *Philebus*? Or again, what is the significance of Aristotle's references to the ideal numbers? Whereas Jackson found the solution in a revised Platonism, Burnet (as those who are acquainted with his edition of the *Phaedo* are aware) sees in those of Plato's writings, which are usually accounted most characteristic, very little¹ that is not to be regarded as the actual teaching of Socrates. In other words, the Platonic Socrates is not to be separated from Socrates as he really was.

This startling conclusion, which is developed in Book II., is so subversive of established opinion that it is not likely to pass unchallenged. But Professor Burnet goes even further than has been indicated above in his reconstruction of the figure of Socrates. Thus it is held that the theory of ideas originated with the Pythagoreans (p. 91), and that Socrates, who was in fact at the head of a Pythagorean society at Athens (pp. 147, 152), inherited it from them (p. 156 f.). The oracle given to Chaerephon marked a dividing-point in Socrates' life; whereas the earlier part was occupied with religious and scientific study and particularly with his theory of the 'forms,' the later was almost entirely devoted to the prosecution of the mission whereby he set himself to convict his fellow-citizens of ignorance (p. 144). The difference between the respective

¹ Professor Burnet does not venture to maintain that Socrates is *never* employed to advocate Platonic doctrine; a notable instance in the *Republic* is discussed on p. 232. But the attempts to account for the appearance of Socrates as protagonist in the *Theaetetus* and the *Philebus* (pp. 235, 237, 248, 324) are not without a suspicion of special pleading, or of what is elsewhere (p. 150) deprecated as 'picking and choosing whatever we please out of Plato.'

portraits in the *Clouds* and the *Memorabilia* is explained as partly due to the fact that Xenophon only knew Socrates when he was already an old man (p. 147). Even apart from this, the credibility of Xenophon is very severely assailed: his acquaintance with Socrates was slight, and his motive was that of the professional romance-writer. On the other hand, it is incredible that in a dialogue designed to record the conversation of his teacher's last hours Plato used Socrates merely as a mask for his own personality.

In belabouring the inadequacy of Xenophon, Professor Burnet is engaged in flogging a dead horse. Everyone admits that for its life-like representation of Socrates both as man and as philosopher the value of Plato's testimony is incomparable. But the question still remains whether the very poverty of Xenophon's philosophical insight has not made him a trustworthy witness concerning the general scope and outline of Socratic teaching. It does not help matters to argue that Xenophon was an associate of Socrates' old age; for on the same principle we should have expected Plato to be chary in his references to the ideal theory, which *ex hypothesi* belonged chiefly to the earlier period. A good deal of stress is laid on the contention that the Platonic Socrates should not be treated as a fictitious character, and that if Plato did not mean what he said his procedure was no less mysterious than inexcusable (pp. 150, 155, 179: cf. *Phaedo*, pp. x-xii). But there are other circumstances to be considered before we can refuse to admit that even in the *Phaedo* Socrates may have posed as the mouthpiece of Platonism. We have seen that it is impossible to get rid of 'the Platonic Socrates' altogether; and we must not forget the character of the public for whose benefit the dialogues were published. In a limited circle much may be taken for granted. The Socratic schools after the death of the master vied with each other in claiming to be his true successors; and the various leaders, in order to base their teaching on Socrates' authority, made it a practice in their published writings to

represent him as advocating in his own person the views of each particular adherent. This was a convention which everyone understood, and the procedure attributed to Plato was exactly parallel to that adopted by Aeschines, Antisthenes, and Phaedo.

The main issue cannot, of course, be adequately discussed within the limits of a review; but a few observations on the treatment of the evidence may not be out of place. Much of it is difficult to appraise; but I am afraid that, in spite of his candour, Professor Burnet has not always avoided the advocate's bias. Verbal points are sometimes pressed which are without substance. Thus it is argued that the use by Polyxenus of the terms *μετοχή* and *μετουσία* in his statement of the *τρίτος ἄνθρωπος* shows that the objection was not directed against Plato, who never employs these words (p. 259, n. 2). But surely the Platonic *μετέχειν* and *μέθεξις* are a sufficient justification for Polyxenus' terminology. When Aristotle (*de gen. et corr.* B 6 335^b 10) quotes 'Socrates in the *Phaedo*' as the author of the doctrine of *μέθεξις*, Professor Burnet strangely insists (p. 166 n.) that the theory is not attributed to Plato, but to 'Socrates in the *Phaedo*.' It would be at least equally cogent to observe that it is attributed to 'Socrates in the *Phaedo*' rather than to Socrates. But these are small matters. In general, I doubt if sufficient weight has been given to the consensus of later opinion that Plato originated the theory of ideas. The consequent depreciation of Aristotle is perhaps the least satisfactory feature of the book. When the question under discussion is the interpretation of the Platonic documents, it is misleading to describe the evidence of Aristotle—our best independent witness—as being merely 'hearsay and inference' employed 'to discredit first-hand testimony' (p. 157, n. 4). A great deal necessarily turns on what Aristotle meant by saying that Socrates did not make universals *χωριστά*, whereas Plato did (*Met.* A 6. 987^b 8, M 4. 1078^b 32). He is understood by Professor Burnet (pp. 165, 316) to have been referring to the *κοινωνία* of the forms with the particulars as expounded by Socrates

in the *Phaedo* and *Republic*. The reasoning fails to convince when we remember that it was Plato, who, according to the same authority, inferred the separate existence of the ideas from the participation in them of τὰ πολλὰ (*Met.* A 6. 987^b 9). Exactly the same account, emphasizing more in detail the error of Plato's new departure, appears in *Met.* M 9. 1086^a 35—^b12. It is difficult to avoid the implication of these passages, but escape is no longer possible if Aristotle actually identified Plato as having been the first to maintain the existence of forms. This he is commonly believed to have stated expressly in *Met.* M 4. 1078^b 13. Hence Professor Burnet is obliged to assume that the reference in that passage is not to Plato, but to the Pythagoreans.¹ But if anyone will compare the two passages (987^a 32—^b 10, and 1078^b 7—32), which trace the development of the Platonic theory and its relation to Socrates and the Pythagoreans, it will scarcely appear doubtful that the one is a doublet of the other. In Book A Plato is said to have been led to a particular conclusion by his acceptance of the Heraclitean doctrine of flux on the one hand, and by the influence of Socratic dialectic on the

other. In Book M precisely the same influences are attributed to those who first propounded the theory of ideas. The inference that Plato was referred to in the later passage is surely irresistible.²

Although the chief importance of the book consists in the bold attempt to re-state the relationship between Socrates and Plato, it is full of interest in its bearing on the interpretation of the dialogues, and for the admirable manner in which the leading arguments of the later works are summarized. I would select as instances the discussion concerning the identity of the εἰδῶν φίλοι mentioned in the *Sophist* (p. 280), and the interesting explanation of the One and the Indeterminate Dyad (p. 320 ff.). The analysis of the *Parmenides* is remarkably clear and valuable, and the conclusion that the antinomies were a parody of the dialectical methods of the Megarics is forcibly stated and is perhaps more satisfactory than any other.

There are many topics on which one is tempted to linger while turning the pages of this book. But enough has been said to recommend it unreservedly to the notice of all serious students.

A. C. PEARSON.

¹ P. 313, n. 1. By a slip *Phaedo* is printed instead of *Sophist* in this note. The only other misprint I have noticed is 'Athen. 509c' (for 508c) on p. 254.

² Burnet admits that 'things are said of them' [οἱ πρῶτοι τὰς ἰδέας φήσαντες εἶναι] 'which are said of Plato in A 6.'

THE WORKS OF THE EMPEROR JULIAN.

The Works of the Emperor Julian, with an English translation. By WILMER CAVE WRIGHT, Ph.D. Vol. II. London: Heinemann, 1913.

IT was a happy idea of the editors of the Loeb Classical Library to include in their series the works of the Emperor Julian; and a yet happier thought, perhaps, to comprise within this second volume almost all the treatises that are most characteristic of the writer, and most likely to interest the general reader. This implies, of course, that the collection is varied in character. Julian as friend appears in the *Consolation to*

Himself on the Departure of Sallust; as satirist we have him seen to advantage in *The Caesars*, and at great disadvantage in *Misopogon*; his philosophic views are displayed in the *Letter to Themistius*, and more clearly in the two Orations to the Cynics; and his projects as religious reorganiser, with his ideal of priestly functions, are set forth in the *Fragment to a Priest*; while the *Letter to the Senate and People of Athens* serves as an apology for his whole life and conduct, and by its very address reveals him as the romantic devotee of the ancient glories of Greece. At the same time there is

a unity of character running through the whole, since all are marked by the remarkably strong personality of Julian himself. The pieces chosen (with, perhaps, the partial exception of the *Consolation to Sallust*) belong to the time after he had abandoned the forced reticence of earlier years which gives a hollow ring to his orations in honour of Constantius. His religious mysticism is not so conspicuous in any of these writings as in the Oration to King Helios and that to the Mother of the Gods, but it is too essential an element of Julian's life and thought to lie hid, and frequently crops up—in less involved and obscure expressions than in the formal orations.

Miss Wright has accomplished her task conscientiously, and it may be said successfully. The text is mainly that of Hertlein, with emendations by more recent scholars, generally given in the footnotes. The Prefaces are short, and some of the notes may seem superfluous, while further elucidation might be occasionally welcome. But we have what is most wanted, references to the sources of most of Julian's quotations. Miss Wright has avoided the temptation of any minute search for 'reminiscences' or direct copying from Dio Chrysostom or other orators, which have occupied late investigators. In the case of a man of such wide reading and retentive memory as Julian's, the task might seem almost superfluous. Miss Wright has made some use of the admirable translation of Julian's philosophical works into German by the Dutch scholar Dr. Rudolf Asmus. Occasionally we may prefer his remarks and renderings to hers. She certainly seems to let her readers lose the point of a good many remarks of Julian about the Cynics by always translating *κύων* as Cynic, whereas Julian uses both *κύων* and *κυνικός*, and references to barking, domestication, and other acts or capacities of dogs are unintelligible to the English reader when applied to Cynics.

These two orations are, perhaps, as interesting as anything in the book, as the character and influence of Cynicism and Neo-Cynicism has not always been adequately appreciated, nor, I think,

much studied since Bernays; and Julian's attitude to both is very characteristic. He respects their independence of character, but condemns their alleged indifference to culture, from which Crates and the early Cynics of his stage are vindicated. It may be noted that Miss Wright seems to share some doubt as to the significance of the Cynic motto (given from Delphi), *Γνώθι σαυτὸν καὶ τὸ νόμισμα παραχάραξον*. This has been treated from the numismatic and philosophic point of view by Dr. Percy Gardner in the *Classical Review* for 1893 (vol. vii., p. 437), and explained as referring to the custom by which the die of one city was stamped on the coinage of another, so as to make it current without effacing the previous stamp. The moral significance is, of course, that the philosopher should borrow thoughts and practices from all quarters, but not accept them as his own till they have received the sanction of his individual reason and conscience. This principle—an admirable one for a critically eclectic school of thought—seems to have been that of the early Cynics and of Julian himself. Miss Wright admits the possible reference to countermarking, and in one place translates: 'give a new stamp to the common currency,' but does not seem quite clear and consistent in her interpretation.

The *Letter to the Athenians* has, of course, for a long time served as material for historians. It would be interesting to examine *The Caesars* with a view to discovering how far Julian's estimate of his predecessors coincides with that which has become traditional. On the whole, it would seem as if his information were not fundamentally different from our own before the development of epigraphical history. It is, perhaps, peculiar that the one vice he singles for special reprobation in Constantine is one not otherwise figuring even in the pagan descriptions of him—licentiousness. Of course, it is evident that Julian often regards the Christian appeal to penitent evil-doers as an encouragement of vice, but this does not explain Constantine's alleged devotion to *τροπή*.

No reader who thinks well of Julian

can help wishing that he had not written the *Misopogon*. It is unpleasant reading almost throughout, and one feels that it was below the dignity of an Emperor—not to say a philosopher—to write bitter invective against a particular group of citizens, even if they were as tiresome as the Antiochenes. His posthumous reputation has suffered by it, seeing that the disagreeable caricature of his own appearance and habits has been taken as photographic, in spite of contemporary evidence to the contrary. But two stories—both told against himself—lighten the rather monotonous abuse: that of his narrow escape from asphyxiation in ‘beloved Lutetia, city of the Parisii,’ through sending for braziers into a room with very damp walls; and that of his preparation to attend, in solemn state, the festival of the Apollo of Daphne, but meeting, on the sacred spot, instead of victims, processions, and choruses, one priest with one goose.

The *Letter to a Priest* shows us Julian trying to adopt into the pagan cults some elements of charity and purity, chiefly borrowed from Christian institutions. Naturally, his idea of purity and the Christians’ do not entirely coincide, but Julian agrees with them in setting the moral above the ceremonial side of religion. He has been vehemently attacked for stealing a leaf from his enemy’s book; but there is no doubt that he genuinely believed a high morality at least to lie implicit in Homer, and that he had hopes of support in his religious efforts from the pagan priesthood. These efforts were, of course, doomed to failure, but the more one reads Julian, the more one feels convinced that in an age of logomachy, of disloyal compromise, of effete institutions and crude reconstructions, he at least was an idealist of the purest type.

Alice Gardner.

WHITE ATTIC VASES.

Athenian White Lekythoi. By ARTHUR FAIRBANKS. 2 vols. 8vo. Pp. ix + 371; ix + 275. Plates xv., xli. Many cuts. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1907, 1914. \$4. 3.50.

Weissgrundige Attische Lekythen, nach Furtwängler’s Auswahl bearbeitet von WALTER RIEZLER. München: F. Bruckmann and Co. Text, pp. xi + 143; 96 plates. £13 15s.

THE Greek lekythi bearing designs painted on a white slip are a distinct class of vases. So far as we know they were made only at Athens, and made for a special purpose, to be buried with the dead. Hence they are found only in graves, sometimes broken, sometimes entire. Besides the Attic cemeteries, a few sites, such as Eretria, and Gela in Sicily, have furnished them in great numbers; but by far the largest collection of them is that in the National Museum at Athens.

Among Greek vases they correspond closely to the Athenian sepulchral reliefs among works of sculpture. The date of the two classes of monuments is the

same, B.C. 470-350: the subjects are nearly analogous, being mainly connected with the tomb: both combine monotony of subject with considerable beauty of style and execution: few visitors to Athens fail to be interested in them.

The white-ground vases have some advantages over the contemporary red-figure vases; while the works of inferior artists, and wanting in mythologic interest (if we except the earliest class of all, where mythological subjects are not unusual), yet their technique is freer, and nearly resembles that of fresco paintings. Thus they serve in a measure to help us to restore in imagination great frescoes, such as those painted on the walls of the Stoa Poikile at Athens, or the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi.

Dr. Fairbanks is one of the able group of archaeologists in charge of the Museum at Boston, which is rapidly becoming one of the great museums of the world. In the first of his two volumes, he gives a *catalogue raisonné* of the vases on which the outlines are drawn in varnish; in the second volume,

he gives a similar list of the vases on which the design is in matt (flat) colour. The distinction is merely technical; between the two classes there is no difference in style and little in date, though the second class is somewhat later.

While not pretending to include every specimen of these vases, Dr. Fairbanks gives the most important. He describes every example minutely, and at the end of every group or class discusses that group as a whole. Nothing could be more complete or thorough-going than his treatment; it is indeed intensive work.

I have but one general criticism to make. Of the vases which he describes only a small proportion are figured in the plates or the text. Some are published in journals or catalogues which are difficult of access: many are not figured anywhere. In the case of these latter, no description can enable one to realise their designs. If Dr. Fairbanks had been able, in the fashion of all the recent catalogues of Greek sculpture, to insert in the text a cut, however imperfect, of the vase, he would have far more fully accomplished his purpose. Such cuts as those on pp. 187 or 209 in Vol. I. would have amply sufficed. The plates are photographic; and so, while they are

quite faithful, they represent the drawings on the convex field in somewhat distorted forms. For more adequate and beautiful representations executed by the cyclograph, and so thrown on to a flat surface, we must go to the much more expensive work of Dr. Riezler. The plates of this book are among the best ever produced, and form a worthy supplement to Furtwängler and Reichhold's plates of black and red figured vases. The vases figured by Riezler are mostly at Athens, and in the museums of Berlin, Paris, and Munich: those in the British Museum had already been published in a volume edited by Mr. A. S. Murray. Dr. Fairbanks and Dr. Riezler each express a high appreciation of the text of the other: they differ in certain small points of interpretation, but these points are too minute to be suitable for discussion in these pages, nor could they be discussed without the help of illustrations. The danger in such minute working is that the writer is sometimes tempted into over-refinement and fanciful treatment of details; and this danger Dr. Fairbanks does not always succeed in avoiding: but generally speaking his interpretations are excellent.

P. GARDNER.

MEUSEL'S CAESAR.

C. Julii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Gallico erkl. von FR. KRANER und W. DITTENBERGER; 17te, vollständig umgearbeitete Auflage von H. MEUSEL. Vol. i., Bks. I.-IV., with a map and three plans. Pp. vii + 464. Weidmann, 1913. M. 4.60.

THIS is not a school book, but is definitely intended for those who already have a considerable knowledge of Latin, especially for students at the University and for teachers. Those who know Meusel's other work on Caesar—for instance, his *Lexicon Caesarianum*, his critical edition of the *Bell. Gall.*, or his edition in this series of the *Bell. Civ.*—will not need to be told that the workmanship is excellent. The subject-matter is treated with great care and

thoroughness both in the Introduction (34 pp.) and 'Übersicht über das Kriegswesen bei Caesar' (43 pp.) and in the notes. But English readers will naturally turn more readily to Rice Holmes's *Conquest of Gaul* and *Ancient Britain* ('ausgezeichnete Bücher,' as Meusel calls them), in which the history is treated more fully and with even greater thoroughness, or to Holmes's edition of the *Bell. Gall.*, in which the results of his researches are given in a less extended form. The great merit of the book before us is that it makes more generally accessible Meusel's unrivalled knowledge of the manuscripts and the language. The Critical Appendix, which covers 118 pages, is a very important part of the book. 'After the completion of the

second volume,' writes the author, 'we shall, I think, be able to come to much more certain conclusions as to the value of the two classes of manuscripts, as to interpolations in both classes, as to the origin of the different readings, and many other questions.' Of the value of Meusel's work on the text, both in this book and in his earlier writings, Holmes has spoken in the *Classical Quarterly* of July, 1914 (viii. 156 ff.). Here I want to call attention to his contribution to our knowledge of the language. 'The Critical Appendix,' he writes, 'will, I venture to hope, show the student how in many cases exact observation of a writer's usage and careful consideration of the context and of the connection of thought enable us to reach, if not a certain, at any rate a probable, decision, where at first it seemed unattainable.' It might be supposed that the language of Caesar was thoroughly known before Meusel began his work. But, as a matter of fact, the elaborate study which he has bestowed on the Commentaries for some thirty years enables him to tell us a great deal that is new and valuable. Some of this is contained in the book before us, but it is desirable to obtain also, if possible, the articles entitled 'Beiträge zur Kritik des Bellum Gallicum,' which Meusel has contributed from time to time to the *Jahresberichte des Berliner Philologischen Vereins*, and especially the long article (177 pp.) which appeared in 1894. Meusel's aim in these articles is, as their title implies, to establish the text in hundreds of doubtful places. But besides their value for their immediate purpose, they have a wider interest. For in order to decide the question, 'What did Caesar write here?' he constantly has to consider, 'What was the exact meaning which Caesar wanted to convey?' and, 'When he wanted to convey such a meaning, what was his usage?' and sometimes, 'What was the usage of his contemporaries?' And the full discussion of these questions by a scholar of great knowledge and insight not only throws new light on the meaning of many of the passages dealt with, but also adds to our knowledge of the

prose language of Caesar's time. An instance will make the matter clearer. In certain passages there is, according to one class of manuscripts, a sudden change from the Perfect to the Historic Present, whereas in the other class the narrative continues in the Perfect. Meusel puts together the passages in which a similar change of tense is found in both classes, and shows under what circumstances and with what effect such a change is employed by Caesar. Having thus discovered Caesar's general usage by a careful study of the passages in which the reading is certain he proceeds to examine the doubtful passages, and is often able to give very strong reasons for the reading which he adopts.

The value of these studies has been recognised in some of the best recent books on the language. Schmalz, in the fourth edition of his *Syntax*, declared them to be 'indispensable to the student of syntax'; Blase made good use of them in his section on tenses in the *Historische Grammatik*; and Stegmann refers to them in many places in the new edition of Kühner's *Grammar*. But the articles are not easily accessible. These 'Jahresberichte' are published with the *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* (Weidmann, Berlin), a periodical which is not generally taken even by our largest libraries. It is much to be hoped that the publisher will issue them separately as a companion to this edition of Caesar, for Meusel has constantly to refer the reader to them for further information.

Meanwhile the book, by itself, will be very useful. Anyone who is puzzled as to the exact meaning of a passage will turn to Meusel and find that the difficulty has been fully considered; he will get the opinion of a good judge and (where a mature scholar is likely to need it) at least some indication of the evidence on which it is based. It should be added that the notes are models of clearness, and that they are printed in a larger type than is usual in this series.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

St. Paul's School, West Kensington, W.

THE BEASTS, BIRDS, AND BEES OF VERGIL.

The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Vergil. A naturalist's handbook to the *Georgics*. By T. F. ROYDS. Blackwell. 3s. 6d. net.

IN the short preface that he has written for this book, Mr. Warde Fowler has justly extended to it a hearty welcome. 'It is, I think, the best commentary we have for the naturalist, the farmer, or the sportsman.' The author does not claim to have written a complete commentary on Vergil's natural history, and it is much to be hoped that a writer so unusually equipped for the task will extend his labours in the same field. For my part I place this slender little book along with Henry's *Aeneidea* and Glover's *Aeneid*, and *Messianic Eclogue*, that is, beside the best modern English work on Vergil.

The only regret one feels after reading this book is that it is not much longer; and in the hope that Mr. Royds will some day produce a larger work, I add a few remarks on passages in which I venture to think that he may profitably reconsider his opinion, or amplify what he has written.

G. III. 140 surely means that *cows in calf*, not *mares in foal*, may be put to light farm work. Vergil's references to horses and cattle in 123 f. are perplexing. Mr. Royds rightly says that Vergil's horses are chargers and racers; and for this reason, as well as on account of the immediate context, it is improbable that *Belgica esseda* in 204 applies to the fashionable carriage affected by Mark Antony, though Servius' note suggests that interpretation.

At l. 255 Mr. Royds explodes the notion that 'Sabellicus sus' is the tame pig. The error is due to Servius from whose note Martyn got his '*even* the Sabellian boar'—cf. '*et mansueta animalia*' in Servius.

I do not understand how 'Spartan' can be 'a stock epithet for a good dog' at G. III. 405, when joined with 'Molossian.' It means here, as Forbiger's note shows, the Spartan breed.

The reference at III. 532 for *uri* meaning buffaloes is to II. (not III.)

374, where Servius has the correct explanation, adding 'in Piceno monte nascuntur.'

It is not the case that 'all commentators [on G. I. 186] ignore *Pro-verbs* vi. 6'; nor is Milton's 'parsimonious emmet, provident | of future, in small room large heart enclosed,' from 'inopi metuens formica senectae,' but from Horace *Sat.* I. 1, 33-35, which Mr. Royds, oddly enough, actually quotes presently. On I. 380 we miss a reference to the passage quoted by Servius from Varro of Atax, who thus becomes responsible for the error that ants in damp weather bring out their larvae ('ova') instead of grain. It is probably to the storing of grain by ants for the winter that Ovid alludes in *Fasti*, II. 685 *vos quoque, formicae, subiectis parcite granis, | post messem praedae copia maior erit*.

Mr. Royds is probably right in his view that at G. I. 307 *tum gruibus pedicas*, etc., the crane is referred to rather as game than as vermin. In Vergil's day, indeed, the stork was preferred to the crane as a table bird, but Varro already, Ovid (*Fasti*, VI. 176), and of course Horace, refer to cranes as table birds. The flesh seems to resemble that of the pheasant (*Stat. Silvae* IV. 6, 9).

It was very like Coleridge to say that a *spirit of religious mysticism* first named the notes of the nightingale a melancholy strain. But in reality it was simply the repeated 'Irus' detected in the note that labelled the harbinger of spring the bird of sorrow and ultimately made ἀνδών a synonym for Elegy (cf. Catullus, 65, 13). Our English poets merely borrowed from the Greeks.

Commenting on G. IV. 40 '*fuscoque et floribus oras | explent*,' Mr. Royds says that *fucus* obviously means *propolis*. This explanation is already given in the note added to Servius. But what then are we to understand by *gluten* in the same context? At l. 160 Mr. Royds explains *gluten* as *propolis*, which is clearly right, and is what Servius says. Pliny XI. 7, 6 combines the two pass-

ages, and repeats the error about flowers; his 'propolis' appears to stand for *fucus* and *gluten* alike, and he writes *favorum stabilimentum* for Vergil's *fundamina favorum*. In order to discover the clue to all this, as well as the origin of Vergil's *narcissi lacrimam* in l. 160, we have but to turn to Aristotle *H. A.* IX. 40, οἰκοδομοῦσι τὰ κηρία φέρουσαι τῶν τ' ἄλλων ἀνθέων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων τὰ δάκρυα. Mackail's rendering 'pollen of flowers' for *fucoque et floribus* does not seem defensible either on scientific or literary grounds.

Mr. Royds remarks that, whereas the ancients universally regarded the queen-bee as male, Xenophon 'in one passage speaks of ἡ ἐν τῷ σμήνῃ ἡγεμὼν μέλιττα.' As a matter of fact, Xenophon makes the leader feminine in more than one passage; but unfortunately he is merely following the grammatical gender of μέλιττα, and in *Cyropaedia* and *Hellinica* he writes ὁ ἡγεμὼν of the queen-bee; so he is no better than the rest.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

TRANSLATIONS OF TACITUS' HISTORIES.

The Histories of Tacitus: An English translation by G. G. RAMSAY. Murray.

Tacitus: the Histories. Translated with Introduction and Notes by W. H. FYFE. Clarendon Press.

TRANSLATORS of Tacitus have sometimes failed to please, because, assuming that his style is abnormal and eccentric in relation to the age in which he wrote, they have endeavoured to reproduce one form of eccentricity by another. If he plays tricks with language (they say), why, then, let us do so too, and we shall be like him. But while Tacitus' style is no doubt a thing apart and a new creation, it is not so in virtue of its general and pervading quality of brevity and pithiness: these are of his age, as he himself says in the *Dialogus*. What distinguishes him is the appropriateness of his epigrams to the subject in hand, and the restraint with which they are employed. He does what his age is doing, only he does it better. You do not find him, like Lucan and Statius, deliberately presenting or manufacturing different facets of a subject so as to be able to make epigrams about it. Apart from this, Tacitus is of his literary generation—at least, as far as can be judged, in the *Histories*: and essays in the bizarre and unusual are therefore out of place for his translators. And as he is above all severe and dignified, and ultra-meticulous in avoiding anything

that might seem to impair the high gravity of his style—witness his reluctance to employ even some harmless technical terms—no translator, clearly, should endeavour to produce a Tacitean effect by journalese or slang. Rather, on this line of reasoning, an English translation which attempts to be to us in some sort what Tacitus was to his contemporaries should employ as good modern literary English as it can. It should choose at will from all our best modern stylists. This rule is so simple that it will doubtless commend itself to everybody.

The English scholarship of our day is fortunate in having produced two excellent translations of the *Histories*—Mr. Fyfe's, published some time ago, and now Professor Ramsay's. Both, as we should expect, are faithful and scholarly: both have a fair measure of success in rendering the epigrams which cost Englishmen much often unprofitable labour, and which French reproduces apparently without an effort; but they differ in their canons of style. Readers must judge for themselves which is the best. Those who prefer plain unadorned Attic (of whom, on the whole, is the present reviewer) will put Professor Ramsay first. Those who look for vigorous rhetoric, and do not object to an occasional phrase that smacks a little of the *Daily Mail*, will rather vote for Mr. Fyfe. Each manner has its dangers, and each has its rewards. It is risky (and, as many

will think, plainly wrong, as inconsistent with the elevation of Tacitus' narrative) to introduce phrases like 'There's no money in that,' and to make Antonius compare his soldiers to 'a lot of helpless idiots'; while it is quite probable that Antonius and his men talked on that level, most certainly it is not Tacitus' level of style in reporting what they said. But though a severe and restrained simplicity may be more consistently pleasing, it cannot be denied that there are moments which call for rhetorical vigour; and it is then that the desire to be above all effective and telling has its reward.

Scholars will never agree about these matters. They may leave carping criticism and rather be thankful that so much has been done by recent translators to familiarise English students with this part of Tacitus' work—now especially when the story of a 'world war' takes on a new interest.

Mr. Fyfe gives us little besides the translation: Professor Ramsay supplies fairly copious and very useful notes and appendices. His Preface and Introduction are both excellent reading.

A. D. G.

THE TEUBNER TEXT OF SENECA'S LETTERS.

L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium Epistularum Moralium Quae Supersunt iterum edidit OTTO HENSE. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. xxxii+634. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1914. M. 6.60, paper; M. 7.20, bound.

IF one glances at Haase's edition, which was reissued by Teubner at intervals for about forty years from 1852 onwards, the mere increase in size due to the inclusion of a good *apparatus criticus* would give some conception of Herr Hense's labours upon the text of Seneca's letters. We have no longer the *Fragmenta* or the spurious correspondence with St. Paul or the elaborate *Index Rerum Memorabilium*, as in Haase, and yet we have a much larger volume. Compared with Hense's own edition of 1898, the text and *apparatus criticus* occupy, in spite of excisions from the latter, fully a dozen pages more.

Hense's *praefatio* furnishes a sound preliminary introduction to the MSS. on which rest the two divisions of the letters to Lucilius (1-88 and 89-124). He is not disposed to be dogmatic on the relative value of the MSS., and indeed he indicates the possibility of new light being thrown on the problem by the researches of Achilles Beltrami. Meanwhile it is an indubitable advantage over Hense's previous edition to have the continuous collation of P and b for letters 1-88 instead of the partial collation which he

published in 1898. For the second part of the letters (89-124), his introduction indicates the value of the *Bambergensis* and of the collation by Bücheler of that MS., whose loss, along with that of many Byzantine and other priceless codices, we owe to the training of the German guns on the Library of Strassburg in 1870.

Hense admits that he thinks better of O than he did previously; and its readings might, therefore, have been oftener quoted. For example, there is significance in its interlinear insertion of *se* between *fecisse* and *et* at 3, 6, 'illa dicet tibi et diem fecisse se et noctem,' and in its agreement with the alteration in b of *potentissimis* to *potentissimus* at 4, 6. Even some of its blunders, like *pariat* for *pareat* in 8, 5 and *togatos* for *togatas* in 8, 8, might have been cited against it.

Hense's attitude towards MSS. of later date than the eleventh century (s) is characteristically rigid and unimaginative. He acknowledges that they are not all derived from the MSS. known to us; but he is so terrified at the presence of interpolation and so enamoured of the need for caution that he will not venture further than to take them as a last resort—'ut ubique hoc teneamus necesse sit, non prius nobis ad eos descendere licere quam omni modo temptatum erit emendationi satis facere ope uetustiorum.' Study of the text of the letters makes it impossible to resist the

conclusion that the later or inferior MSS. do in places retain the correct tradition; and slavish adherence to the 'best' MS. or MSS. may mislead into fruitless emendation or unnecessary obelising. Here, as in a good many other cases, Hense has something to learn from Kronenberg, who touched on this matter in *Cl. Q. I.* pp. 212-213, and cited with much plausibility, to my mind, a series of correct readings from *s*, which I need not now detail. By showing inadequate respect to the inferior MSS., as Kronenberg says, 'factum est ut in nouissima editione interdum mendose legantur quae emendate Lipsii illi ueteres et Gronouii ediderunt.' Thus, at 108, 8, if Hense would not go the length of departing from 'tunc illa anima bona ueluti soluta excitatur' (BA) in favour of 'tunc illa animi bona ueluti sopita excitantur' (*s*), he might at any rate have mentioned Kronenberg's commendation of the latter. There are other passages that appear to me cases for surrendering to *s*: e.g. 20, 2, a troublesome passage on the need for accord between theory and practice; and 84, 8, a difficult piece which is left in a more satisfactory condition if the testimony of *s* (*magni uir ingenii*) is allowed to come to the rescue. As he has this rooted distrust of *s*, it is almost surprising to find that in 40, 2, he accepts *una* in preference to *ima* of *p* LP *b*; and yet, a few paragraphs further on, at 40, 9, he retains *uideris istos* of *p* LP *b* as against *audieris istos* of *s*, which, I agree with Kronenberg, must be correct; for Seneca here refers to his words near the beginning of the letter, '*audisse* te scribis Serapionem philosophum.'

For his general account, however, of the principal sources of the text, and for a diligent recension in the light of fuller collations of the best MSS., Senecan students must feel grateful to Herr Hense; but they will look in vain for inspired or inspiring qualities in his textual reconstructions, or even for a complete and consistent report of what other scholars have achieved in the way of emendation. There is a certain caprice in the selection or in the bare mention of emendations which makes one realise that to get a sound knowledge of the history of the text one must

still consult for oneself the contributions of Lipsius, Madvig, Kronenberg, and others. Hense will quote *Variana clade* from Lipsius of Louvain for *Mariana* at 47, 10, and his convincing *in mica* for the unintelligible *inimica* of the MSS. at 51, 12; but at 76, 30 he reads *includunt* without recording either the reading *inlidunt* or Lipsius' *elidunt*, which can be supported by apposite Senecan quotations. Again he quotes Madvig in one place and leaves him unquoted in another where his opinion would seem equally helpful, e.g. in one of the most uncertain passages in the letters, 15, 8, where he proposed *in elatis* for *in id latus* along with a repunctuation of the passage. So too Kronenberg is frequently quoted and frequently omitted. He ought to have been cited at 104, 6 for his ingenious idea that under *obruerant* lurks an original *obructant*; at 109, 6 where he supports Haase's *hoc [ut] scias* with Senecan parallels, and where their *[ut]* deserves mention just as much as the *[sic]* of Windhaus; and at 121, 21, 'si tamen exigit, dicam, quomodo omne animal perniciose intellegere conatur,' where Kronenberg's objections to both mood and meaning of *conatur* should have been taken into account, as well as his suggestion that Seneca wrote *cogatur*. And surely at 77, 5, even if the editor was himself satisfied with the description of Tullius Marcellinus as 'adulescens quietus et cito senex,' he should have reported Kronenberg's *uietus*—a Terentian epithet of *senex*, by the way—consideration of which might have saved Hense from the blunder in his *Index Nominum*, whereby this 'quiet' Marcellinus, who starved himself to death on Stoic advice, is identified with the Marcellinus of Letter 29, who, when philosophically reproved, used to crack boisterous jokes fit to make a mourner laugh!

From his bibliography of works on Seneca since 1898 the editor omits Professor Summers' valuable edition of *Select Letters of Seneca*, the text of which was declared in the notice of *The Classical Review*, vol. xxiv. (1910), pp. 224-225, to be 'infinitely better than the unsatisfactory text of Hense.' There also he omits the same author's *Notes and Emendations to Seneca's Letters*, pub-

lished in the *Classical Quarterly* in 1908 and 1909. He just knows enough of Professor Summers' work to cite his name (with a wrong initial) in connection with his handling (*Cl. Q.*, vol. ii., 1908) of certain difficult specimens of Maecenas' style in 114, 5-6. Thus his criticisms on the text and punctuation of Hense's first edition, although fortified by real knowledge of Senecan usage, are entirely thrown away upon the editor. Whether the reason for such omissions be ignorance or arrogance, the fact is equally regrettable, and Hense's edition and its readers are the losers thereby. For want of noting the cures prescribed by others in difficult cases, he has sometimes proved a 'too quick despairer' concerning the text. There are many passages where, while he need not have accepted emendations proposed, he ought to have recorded them. Thus, to take only a few instances, 84, 8 is left in a better textual condition by Professor Summers, as well as 12, 8, where his reading 'non *alia* . *alias* contractior *alias* productior *uita* . itaque' gets rid of a lacuna before *itaque*. At 47, 5 Professor Summers' theory explaining the presence of *quod* before *cum ad cenandum* should have been noted, and at 54, 6 his substitution of *remisit* is an almost certain one for *remansit*, which does not suit the abatement of a disease. Again, in 56, 4 the puzzling 'qui ad Metam Sudantem *tubulas* experitur et *tibias*' contains Gruter's invention of *tubulas*; but this is just a case where all doctors are to be tried, and Professor Summers' '*tubulos* experitur *ut* *tibias*' must be considered. In 84, 1, 'a lectionibus *nihil* recessi,' Hense accepts for his text *nihil* from Bücheler, but in his note thinks *non* of the inferior MSS. may be right. This is to sacrifice his principle of not stooping to the 5 MSS. ('non ad eos descendere') until every way of emending the better MSS. has been tried; for here the essential preliminary is not even emendation but attention to plain Latin grammar. I accept Professor Summers' defence of the better MSS. 'a lectionibus recessi.' There is no need to thrust in a negative: if the tense of *recessi* be observed, it marks Seneca's temporary indisposition to study before starting on the journey to which he has referred in a

series of present tenses: he means 'I have recently dropped reading; but it is a necessary thing, I fancy.'

The passage at 15, 8 on management of the voice is interesting not only for its substance but for its textual difficulty. Seneca says that in invective the speaker has to be now impetuous, now restrained—'modo lentius, prout uox quoque te hortabitur, in *id* *latus*.' Hense's omission of Madvig's *in elatis* has been already noted; Professor Summers' *inclinatus* is also unmentioned: it merits consideration, though I do not go so far with him as to call the vague *id* in *id* *latus* 'quite meaningless.'

For the sentence which follows I should myself venture to suggest a cure. In it Seneca says the voice should come down gradually, not 'tumble down'—'descendat, non decidat'; and then we reach confusion when we read in *p* *mediatorisui* *habeat*, in *L¹P* *mediatoris sui* *habeat*, and in *b* *moderatoris sui temperamentum* *habeat*. Madvig emended to 'media oris ui eat' (or 'abeat'), and Bücheler to 'media oris uia abeat,' which Hense adopts, following it by the reading of *b* 'nec indocto et rustico more desaeuiat,' where *p* *L¹P* give, correctly in my opinion, *et hoc* before *indocto*. I believe the corrupt text conceals 'nec uindemiatoris uim habeat et hoc indocto et rustico more desaeuiat' in reference to the abusive prowess of the *durus uindemiator* in Horace, *Sat.* I. vii. 30: 'he should not exhibit the violence of the vine-dresser, and fume in that untrained and rural style.' Then *mediatoris* is due to one of the transpositions that are not uncommon in these MSS.

The imperfect recognition and incomplete record of the work of other scholars upon Seneca make the weakest points in this edition, and shake one's confidence in some of the textual changes admitted. At times, it looks as if Hense permitted himself to follow Gertz unnecessarily; thus at 4, 2 he inserts his addition in 'puerilitas remanet: et hoc quidem peior *res* est quod auctoritatem habemus senum, uitia puerorum,' although *peior* may easily refer to *puerilitas* without inserting *res*; and at 5, 2 there is absolutely no case in favour of departing from the united testimony of *p* *L¹P* *b* 'quicquid aliud ambitionem peruersa

uia sequitur, euita,' i.e. 'shun everything else that by an unnatural route aims at parade (or posing as a philosopher). Gertz's 'correction' is 'ambitio nempe peruersa,' which only suggests that *nempe*, here awkwardly foisted into the text, possesses an alluring attraction for some foreign editors in their reconstruction of Silver Age texts. In reviewing Kukula's edition of Pliny's letters, I pointed out that in III. v. 10 his *nempe* for the *saepe* of all the codices and editions is a purely arbitrary change (C. R., June, 1914, p. 136).

Hense's own contributions to the text are not startling: on the whole he is fairly conservative. Several of his proposals are of the class possible. At 24, 26, where the weary round 'expergiscar, dormiam; esuriam, . . .; algo, aestuabo' is recounted, he gives at least a likely stop-gap in *fastidiam*; but *satiabor* of the later MSS. is equally satisfactory. Possibly too at 86, 12, which declares the older Romans not to have been over particular about baths, he may be right to insert *olim* in 'hoc loco dicit aliquis "olim liquet mihi inmundissimos fuisse,"' where some MSS. have *aliquotis*; still, Kronenberg's deduction of the stages in the corruption might have been cited. Also he makes a plausible suggestion at 92, 4 'in his erit beata uita, sine quibus *honestas*' instead of *non est*, for its elliptic abruptness is not an argument against it in Seneca; only, his critical note is inadequate and misleading, because 'dubitatur A. I. Kronenberg' is not a correct account of Kronenberg's definite comment 'retinendum puto quod est in MSS.' Several of the proposals, on the other hand, are gratuitous, e.g. at 86, 8 the insertion of *deuicantur* before 'et in antiquorum numerum reiciuntur' is needless if *et* is translated 'actually'; or they are unlikely and even illogical, e.g. his reading in 104, 20 of *demenda* for the second *emenda* of B and A in 'te igitur emenda, onera tibi detrahe et demenda desideria intra salutarem modum continue': it is not reasonable advice that one should merely 'restrain desires that ought to be entirely removed' (*demenda*). Here the cure lies in excising *emenda* as a dittograph. In *salutarem* Hense has returned to Haase's reading; but he does not explain that he has dropped his own

previous reading *intra saltem modum*, nor does he now mention, as in 1898, his still earlier guess *intra sanum saltem modum*.

There are, in fact, not infrequent changes upon the text of 1898; only, it is unfortunate that as a rule the reader is left to discover the changes for himself by comparison of the editions. Thus, at 7, 5, 'plagis agitur in uulnera,' given previously as a sort of stage-direction independent of the remarks of the spectator of the gladiatorial fight, is now altered to 'plagis agatur in uulnera,' as an integral part of the remarks. It will be freely admitted that some of the changes are improvements; e.g. 21, 10 'cum adieris eius hortulos et inscriptum †hortulis' is now more wisely obelised; and conversely at 53, 10 Hense has done well to withdraw his obelus from 'idem philosophia rebus omnibus.' It is an improvement at 47, 5 to have added since 1898 the tempting suggestion *toro* from Rossbach in 'alius reliquias temulentorum *toro* subditus colligit'; for some word must be mentally or literally supplied with *subditus*. The gap at 49, 5 in 1898 'eodem loco . . . dialecticos' is now laudably filled by the acceptance of Hermes' *conloco*. *Boletatione* of 77, 18 has been strengthened by two additional parallels, *cothurnatio* and *tubulatio*. But there are other cases where the changes are not to the good. It is no improvement to have dropped the record of the emendation *munus Graecum* made by several scholars at 15, 9; nor is it an improvement to have tacitly withdrawn the obelus from 56, 2, where *biberari* cannot be deemed a reading of self-evident merit!

One change of which the introduction gives due notice affects a principle of orthography to which Hense gave his adhesion in the preface of his earlier edition, but which he had not accepted in time to incorporate in his text. Following Gertz and others, he took perfect forms like *periit* and *abiit* from the inferior MSS. This has been reversed: so that at 93, 4 for the *periit* of 1898 we now read *perit*.

It is serviceable to have sandwiched between text and *apparatus criticus* frequent references to the literary and philosophical sources of Seneca's quota-

tions, besides occasional illustrations of his thought. In the text itself I do not feel reconciled to the method of printing quotations from Latin poets straightforward like prose.

In the mass of detail involved in the notes, perfection is naturally unattainable; but oversights and errors are commendably few. References to the text are wonderfully accurate: on p. 12, however, *omnia* of 6, 4 is not referred to its right line. If in the opening sentence of letter 22 for *speciosis* the *petiosis* of *p* is to be recorded, then *spetiosis*, which is clear in Chatelain's facsimile page from *b*, should also be given. At the obstinate passage in letter 21, 10, it is unfortunate that the note is wrong in recording *adieretis* as the reading of *b*: it is clearly *adieritis* in Chatelain. There is a slip too at the close of the thirteenth book; for it is not enough that the note

should say '*post VALE in P subscriptio haec Ragambertus quamuis indignus laicus barbatus hunc codicem scripsit*': the words '*Explicit liber xiii. eptarum Senecae*' intervene in a line between '*Vale*' and '*Ragambertus*.'

The text of Seneca's letters cannot, in face of many puzzling passages, be pronounced at all definitely established; but there is at least sufficient basis in the collations furnished by Herr Hense's edition to justify the hope that we shall in the near future obtain a recension of the text, accompanied by that adequate kind of commentary on the life, the philosophy and the style of the author which British scholarship is fitted to produce.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

*Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

THE LETTERS OF SIDONIUS.

The Letters of Sidonius. Translated, with introduction and notes, by O. M. DALTON, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Pp. clxxxiv+86; vol. ii.=268. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. 3s. 6d. net.

It appears that no complete translation into English of the letters of Sidonius has ever been published, and this is one justification for the existence of the book under review. But it is easy to find others. It may be truly said that Sidonius is an interesting figure, and that his writings are of importance to the classical scholar, if only because he is such a persistent imitator of of Statius and the Younger Pliny. There are probably few authors so likely to tempt the classical scholar to transgress beyond the limits of A.D. 150. For, though the Christian 'taint' is there, it is very unobtrusive, and Sidonius, bishop though he was, could probably have passed a much stiffer examination on the Latin poets than on the Scriptures. The publication of the comparatively recent critical editions of Lütjohann and Mohr (the latter in the Teubner series) is a fresh reason

why an English translation of the letters should have been attempted; and it may be at once said that Mr. Dalton has produced an admirable work from every point of view, in what must be regarded as the most beautiful and satisfying series of translations of the classics that has ever appeared.

The introduction, to which are appended a bibliography and a list of correspondents, with biographical notes, is of necessity long, occupying in fact a third of the total work. The author and his works, as well as his environment in the widest sense, are discussed with fulness of knowledge and in a very interesting and attractive way. Mr. Dalton has not neglected the opportunities which work in the British Museum gives to become a master of the bibliography of his subject, and no one would guess from his literary style that his duties were almost exclusively concerned with the externals of books. A few notes on this part of the book may be given. On p. vii one is offended by the spelling of *stilus*, which is given correctly in another part of the book; the monstrosity '*Caius*' (p. xi), like *coena* (p. lix), *prediatores* (p. cxxviii),

seems very hard to kill; there are several places where the printing is hardly worthy of the Clarendon Press (pp. xix, xxxiii, xcii, clv); on p. lxxix, n. 2, 'seventh' is surely a mistake for 'sixth,' the date of St. Benedict's *Rule*; on p. lxxxix Faustus' 'work' on Free Grace is referred to, but Gelasius speaks of *opuscula*, and in the first note on the same page the volume of the *Corpus* should be given, whether xi. or xvi.; on p. lxxxvii, add § 8 to the chapter vii of Ammianus; on p. lxxxix, n. 2, a ! is wanted at the end; on p. xcvi the source of the expression *tunicata quies* (Mart. x. 51, 6) might have been given; on p. cviii the wearing of silk in Gaul might have been illustrated from the sermons of Caesarius of Arles; on p. cxii and elsewhere the name 'Filimatus' is so spelt, because the defective spelling of a Merovingian seventh or eighth century archetype is reproduced; the name is, of course, Greek in origin, and should be written 'Filemintius'; the proper names in Sidonius should, in fact, be overhauled by some one who has made a special study of that subject; on p. cxii it might have been as well to say that, although papyrus was not 'adapted' for use on both sides, it was nevertheless frequently so employed; on p. cxvi, n. 1, and elsewhere, the important work of Roger, *L'Enseignement des Lettres Classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin*, ought to have been mentioned; on p. cxxv, n. 1, l. 5 from foot, 'xi.' should be 'xiv.'; on p. cxxxiv no reference to the special use of *quia* and *quod* should have been made, as it was much older than Sidonius' time, and in no way confined to Gaul; on p. cxliii it would have been well to give the reference to the passage in Cassiodorus where he alludes to Sidonius; on p. clii the number of the Madrid manuscript is not given; on p. clviii, l. 16, 'xviii.' should be 'lviii.' In the list of correspondents the best modern edition of the surviving works should always have been mentioned, for instance, under Eucherius and Claudianus Mamertus; the result of the omission to do this

is that the non-expert reader never knows whether such works survive or not.

It would be impossible to praise the quality of the translation too highly. It may be doubted if more care and good sense have gone to the production of any modern translation of a classic. The general level is such that it has not proved possible to select any passages as superior to the greater part of the work. The skill of the translator appears in his rendering of such a letter as the thirteenth of Book VIII. And yet it has not been possible to agree everywhere with the translator's view of a passage. For example, in that very letter, § 1, *sine invidia potentem* means, not 'a man of influence who makes a blameless use of power,' but 'a man of influence who never arouses envy.' Again, in the fourth letter of Book VI., *isto deductam ante aliquot annos istique distractam* means, not 'that some years ago she had been brought here before being removed elsewhere,' but 'that some years ago she had been brought here and sold here,' this sense of *distraho* being found as early at Tacitus, but of course more naturally employed of property sold in lots. In the eighteenth epistle of the seventh book, § 3, surely *liberum* means 'outspoken' and not 'a lover of freedom.'

The notes hit the happy mean between prolixity and meagreness. I do not know that I quite understand 34, 1: at 50, 2 Cassiodorus' *Institutio* should have been employed in illustration; at 51, 1 the spelling Tyrannius might have been mentioned, and a decision come to between the two; at 102, 1, a view is expressed with regard to the meaning of *contestatiunculae*, which is not exactly in harmony with that stated by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* s.v.

In conclusion it ought to be mentioned that this work, which ends with a good index, is informed throughout by a loving knowledge of modern France.

A. SOUTER.

Aberdeen.

SHORT NOTICES

Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Phaedonem Commentaria edidit WILLIAM NORVIN. Leipzig: Teubner, M. 5.

Philodemi de Ira liber: edidit CAROLUS WILKE. Leipzig: Teubner, M. 3.60.

THE Teubner text of *Olympiodorus* contains 12 pp. of preface, 244 pp. of text, and nearly 30 pp. of indexes. The text is based on a good and reliable MS., ascribed to a date not far removed from that of the famous *codex Clarkianus* of Plato, which also contains the commentaries on the *Gorgias* and *Alcibiades*. Most of the *Phaedo* commentaries, however, are not the genuine work of *Olympiodorus*, but the production 'incerti auctoris,' or *eclogae* from a variety of sources. The passages of the *Phaedo* upon which *Olympiodorus* himself comments are taken from *Phaed.* 61 C-79 E, and his observations are of the usual Neoplatonic type and sufficiently tedious. Nor does the text raise many critical questions of general interest. On p. 146 the editor suggests *πρώτως* for *πρώτου* in the phrase *οὐ προῦπήρχε τοῦ πρώτου ζώντος*, and again *πρώτως* for *πρώτων* in the phrase *περὶ πάντων τῶν πρώτων ὑφισταμένων* on the same page. Would not *πρώτον* (advb.) be an easier correction in both places?

M. Wilke's *Philodemus* is a more interesting book. It consists of about 55 pp. of preface, 100 pp. of text, and 15 pp. of indexes. The text, drawn from Papyrus Herculaneus 182, is to a large extent imperfect and fragmentary, and has called for the exercise of the ingenuity of a number of scholars, including Th. Gomperz, Cobet and Crönert. The preface contains not only an account of the papyrus, but also important discussions of the sources of Philodemus' ethics and other historico-philosophical matters, such as the identification of Nicasirates and Timasagoras. Students of Stoicism especially should consider the arguments by which the editor comes to the conclusion—'Philodemus, vel potius Zeno, quem ille sectatur, cum iram describeret, omnia fere ex Chrysippi

curatorio libro hausisse mihi videtur; his perpauca ex Epicureorum scholis addidit; nonnulla denique lumina orationis ex Bione adpersit.' And to philological critics the text presents riddles such as this—'What was it Metrodorus really said when he said "τ . . . σοφοῦ θυμός," and thereby *συνεμφαίνει τὸ λίαν βραχέως*?' Philippson guessed *τιθὸς*, Crönert *τίς ὁ*. Like Philippson I am 'dubitans,' but mindful of Ps. 68. 2 ('Like as the smoke vanisheth, so shalt thou drive them away') I venture the guess *τῶφος*.

R. G. BURY.

The Works of Aristotle translated into English: *Magna Moralia, Ethica Eudemia, De Virtutibus et Vitiis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 5s. net.

HERE we have the whole of Vol. IX. of the *Oxford Aristotle in English*, save only the *Nicomacheans*. Mr. St. George Stock is responsible for the *Magna Moralia*, and Mr. J. Solomon for the rest. In addition to the translations the volume contains an Introduction of some 22 pages by Mr. Stock, which deals mainly with the literary problems presented by the ethical writings which bear Aristotle's name, such as the relation of *E. E.* to *E. N.*, the origin of the disputed books, the authorship of the *Great Ethics* and so on. There are also elaborate 'tables of contents,' or analyses, and indexes to all the works. Both translators follow the text of Susemihl, variations from which are recorded in the foot-notes, which also indicate the parallels in *E. N.*, *E. E.*, and *M. M.* It is specially interesting to notice how often the translator of *E. E.* has adopted the brilliant textual corrections of Professor Henry Jackson, whose writings—as is justly observed in the Preface—have 'shed a flood of light on the corrupt passage, Bk. VII., ch. 13, 14,' and—we may add—on many other tracts of bogland. As examples of such corrections we may cite *ἄλλης* for *ἀλλ' εἰς*, 1234^b 28; *ἐστὶ νῆ Δία* for

ἔστιν ἡ διὰ, 1236^a 33; ὅτι δὲ for ἐστὶ δὲ, 1247^a 15. A few other corrections are due to Mr. W. D. Ross, or to Mr. Solomon himself. One place where Mr. Solomon rejects Jackson's emendation is 1236^a 36: the MSS. have Γλαῦκ' ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τὸν σοφὸν φίλον ἔσκε μάχεται: Bekker prints σὺν for σοφὸν: Jackson proposed Γλαῦκ', ἐ. ἀνὴρ, ὁ σοφὸς φιλεῖ ὃς κε μάχεται: Solomon adopts τόσσον φίλος (Fritzsche) ἔστε (J. S.). There is a good deal to be said for τόσσον, but ἔστε is questionable, and the original verse is still, I fear, to seek: possibly τὸν σοφὸν is a relic of ὄφελος. Another place where the translator is dissatisfied alike with the MSS. and with Jackson is 1243^b 32 ff: here for τῇ σοφίᾳ πρὸς τὸ πλούσιον of MSS. the reading adopted is τί σοφία πρὸς τὸν πλούτον (J. S.), 'the ratio of wisdom to wealth'; but would not this be improved by the insertion of the article before σοφία? However, *in re incerta* it is perhaps worth while to suggest a further reconstruction of the passage, viz. τί σοφιάς πρὸς τί πλού<του> ἵσον, εἴτα τί δοθέν πρὸς ἑκατέρου.

As regards the actual work of translation, it would be difficult to criticise it usefully without a careful comparison of it in detail with the original, and this I cannot profess to have made. But, so far as I have tested it, it is clearly done with scholarly care and accuracy, hitting the happy mean between pedantic literalism and loose paraphrase, and the names of the translators are in themselves a sufficient guarantee that the renderings of the *Ethics* are not likely to fall below the high level of the other volumes. R. G. B.

Hagios Nikolaos, der Heilige Nikolaos in der Griechischen Kirche. Texte und Untersuchungen von GUSTAV AURICH. Band I. Die Texte. Leipzig, Berlin: Teubner, 1913.

A THOROUGH examination of this work hardly falls within the scope of the *Classical Review*, as the texts are post-classical—one in popular Greek and one translated from Old-Slavonic, and the narratives do not throw much light on imperial history, though possibly the *Untersuchungen*, which are to form

Vol. II., may bring to light what substratum of fact may be gathered from the whole collection. The book may, however, be mentioned as a remarkable specimen of textual examination of scattered sources relating to a conspicuous figure in Eastern hagiography.

This figure is composite. The learned editor distinguishes Nikolaos, Bishop of Myra (in Lycia), from Nikolaos, Archimandrite of the Monastery of Sion, near to Myra. The earliest document of the collection (with the doubtful exception of one) has to do with the Sionite only, though it states that he was made Bishop at Pinare. It places him in the time of Justinian, whereas the stories of Nikolaos of Myra are connected with the reign of Constantine. Among the stories of this Nikolaos is one relating to Artemis, which is of some interest. An evil demon frequenting the destroyed Temple of Artemis assumes the form of a woman, and presents some pilgrims to the shrine of St. Nikolaos with a vessel of oil for the sanctuary. But the Saint, in a vision, bids the men throw the vessel overboard, whereon appears much froth with smoke and a wild sea, till the Saint rescues his devotees from shipwreck. Does the *δαιμόνιον* stand for Artemis herself?

English readers will naturally look for a suggestion of Santa Claus in the multitude of stories of the posthumous miracles of St. Nikolaos, but will not find much connection, except, possibly, in the story of how the Saint brought about the return of a pawned tablecloth to a worthy but indignant couple, and revealed a store of coins to some people who wished to keep his feast but had not the necessary means.

A. G.

Palaeographia Latina: Exempla Codicum Latinorum phototypice expressa Scholarum maxime in usum edidit Maximilianus Ihm. Series I. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. s. a. (c. 1909). 18 plates 17½ × 14 inches, with 22 facsimiles and 16 pp. 8vo. of Latin description. Price M. 5.

THE cheapening of collotype and similar processes during the last few years

has made it possible to issue collections of facsimiles at a price within the reach of undergraduates and even schoolboys. Of such collections Ihm's is the cheapest, yet its facsimiles are the best in execution and are full size. Naturally the number is rather insufficient and this drawback is increased by the somewhat unsatisfactory character of the selection, the editor taking half his specimens from the Wolfenbüttel Library. There is, for instance, only one specimen of uncial, a page of *gromatici veteres*, very difficult for learners because of its bad text and technical subject-matter with special abbreviations; and there is only one example of insular script, a page of the life of Heliogabalus not convenient for general study. Something more satisfactory than Martianus Capella might have been found for the thirteenth century, and the examples of humanistic writing, though interesting, are rather abnormal. However, on the whole, the proportion of classical writers in the series is high, and the principal varieties of book-hand are just represented. If a second series should follow, no doubt the weak points will be made good. The letterpress is excellent, packing into small space all necessary information as to each MS., referring to the literature, and giving the place where the text can be found, but not giving any help towards reading or any explanation of corrupt words. Such help might have made the book more useful for solitary students, but it is well adapted for use in a class in which the teacher can furnish skilled guidance.

E. H. M.

Tibulli Carmina. Recognovit J. P. POSTGATE. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Editio Altera, 1914. Pp. xiv + ? 2s.

Selections from Tibullus. Edited by J. P. POSTGATE. Second Edition. Pp. lii + 227. Macmillan. 5s.

PROFESSOR POSTGATE'S Oxford text of Tibullus now shares with some half dozen other volumes in the series to which it belongs the honour of attaining a second edition. We may fairly infer that Tibullus is quite as much read as he

ought to be, and it may equally be allowed that Professor Postgate's edition, with its admirable finish and restraint, is a model of editing. The changes in the new edition are very few—some of them consist merely of a reversion to the reading of the Ambrosian MS., which Professor Postgate has collated anew: others embody corrections of the editor already published elsewhere, among which the palm belongs, perhaps, to *quamque . . . ferar* in 3, 4, 50. (In the same poem, 26, the retention of *humanum* is something of a tax on the goodwill of the reader.)

The same editor's *Selections from Tibullus* has long been well known as one of the best volumes in a series which contains much work that is extremely good, and much that is very poor indeed. We are not clear that the book is improved by the pictures which variegate the text. But presumably they make their appeal to the schoolboy (though even he should perhaps be instructed that the first of them, which we took to represent a schoolmaster with a birch-rod, is nothing more terrible than Ceres with a sheaf of corn).

Anyone who has these two volumes, with Professor Postgate's admirable Translation of Tibullus, in the Loeb Series, will feel that the editor has deserved well of a Latin poet who carries the art of being pleasing to a point at which we become a little inclined to despise it.

H. W. G.

THE LAND OF TEMPLES.

Pictures in the Land of Temples. BY JOSEPH PENNELL. Forty Lithographs. London: Heinemann. 5s. net.

MR. JOSEPH PENNELL has produced these forty lithographs, representing temples in Italy, Sicily, and Greece, as the result of a challenge by a Boston authority, who told him that he was a mere 'ragtime sketcher' incapable of appreciating Greek art or drawing it. The consequence was a visit to Greek lands in 1913 and a very pleasant book of illustrations. Mr. Pennell has an excellent eye for the best point of view; it would be possible to know Segesta and

Girgenti well, and yet not have discovered with his accurate judgment the exact point from which the temples look most dignified and impressive. He has also obtained fine effects in sunrise or failing light: a sunrise (No. VI.) behind the pillars of the Temple of Concord at Girgenti is very impressive, and the solemnity of the giant pillars of the Olympieum (No. XVIII.) as night is falling, and a little moon is dimly visible above the Acropolis is strikingly shown. Naturally he is not always equally successful: the foreground of the theatre in Taormina looking more like a battered factory in the La Bassée region, and the Acro-

Corinthus (in No. XVI.) looks dumpy and no more impressive than, say, the Areopagus. Nearly half the drawings are of the Temples of Athens, and it is to be regretted that except for a distant view of it from the Acropolis, we have no picture of the 'Theseum.' The short letter-press that accompanies the drawings is over-exclamatory: we are not really helped to greater appreciation of beauty by cries from the author of, 'How it piles up!' But lovers of Greece will be grateful to Mr. Pennell for what he has seen and what he has shown them.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

NOTES AND NEWS

WE publish notes of some fairly recent proceedings of the Northumberland and Durham Classical Association.

On December 5 Professor W. R. Hardie read a paper on 'Fate and Freewill in Greek and Roman Poets.'

The Greek attitude was not one of abject submission: fate was not allowed to paralyse action or to palliate offences: nothing is to be inferred from the fact that what the Erinyes decreed did happen, because the poet had to choose a story in which a dreadful thing did happen.

The Greek conception of fate is vague, almost impersonal—life is rather a time of trial and discipline than of abject subversiveness. The views of Roman poets are clouded by 'rhetoric' and astrology. In the greater poets there is no sense of oppression, but rather an almost Bergsonian notion of an intelligent power, which approves intelligent activity.

A discussion followed.

On March 21 Professor S. Wight Duff lectured on Phaedrus, the fabulist of Rome.

The lecturer first sketched the life, then illustrated the Books of the Fables and Appendix, then Phaedrus. Greek examples and the relationship of Phaedrus to Aesop; also the new material drawn from Roman life and

politics. The lecturer exemplified Phaedrus' gentle art of making enemies, and concluded with some comments on the perennial interest of fable, and on Phaedrus as a man, on his style, art, metre.

A discussion followed.

On May 30 Dr. F. B. Jevons read a paper entitled 'Ancient Art and Ritual.' The first part dealt critically with Miss Harrison's volume bearing that title in the Home University Library. The lecturer pointed out that ritual is the traditional mode of addressing gods, and therefore assumes belief in gods, while Miss Harrison inverts this. As regards the relation of art to ritual, she maintains at different times that ritual develops out of art, and also the contrary position that art develops out of ritual, and she further maintains in effect that both these positions are false, that ritual does not develop out of art, nor art out of ritual, but that both develop out of something else, viz. the pantomimic dance. In following Aristotle's dictum that tragedy originated with the leaders of the dithyramb, Miss Harrison has overlooked the fact that the performers of the dithyramb never wore masks. In the second part Dr. Jevons made a new suggestion with regard to the origin of drama.

In drama there are always masks, never in dithyramb: men alone wear them; they are the one feature common to tragedy, satyric drama, and comedy. Were there originally in tragedy the masks of deceased heroes and ancestors, worn by those who re-enacted the deeds of the mighty dead? In satyric plays were the masks of the lower classes not masks of deceased ancestors, but of the demons of popular belief? In comedy the lecturer pointed out that

at a harvest home it would be the corn-spirit who would be expected to appear.

In the discussion which followed, Dr. Hadow illustrated the lecturer's suggestion of satyric masks by a comparison with the little devils of miracle plays, put in to please the ignorant: and in comedy, which consists so largely in making fun of people, suggested the masks were of contemporaries.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Browne* (H.) First Lessons in Numismatics, for Junior Students, in Latin and Greek. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 48. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1915. 6d.
- Caesar* (Belgian Campaign). Edited by S. E. Winbolt. 6½ × 4½. Pp. 108. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1915. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Conrad* (C. C.) The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy. University of Chicago (Doctor's Dissertation). 10" × 6½". Pp. 86. Menasha, Wisconsin: Banta Publishing Co., 1915.
- Davidson* (J. F.) The Anacreontea, etc., translated into English verse, with Essay, Notes, and additional Poems. 7" × 5". Pp. x+212. London: J. M. Dent and Sons. 4s. 6d. net.
- De Wesseliitsky* (G.) Russia and Democracy, with a Preface by Henry Cust. 8½" × 5½". Pp. viii+96. London: W. Heinemann, 1915. Cloth, 1s. net.
- Garrod* (H. W.) A Book of Latin Verse. 6¾" × 4¾". Pp. 307. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Haverfield* (F.) Roman Britain in 1914 (British Academy, Supplemental Papers, III.). 9¾" × 6¼". Pp. 67. Illustrated. Oxford: University Press, 1915. 2s. 6d. net.
- Howard* (A. A.) Latin Selections, illustrating Public Life in the Roman Commonwealth in the time of Cicero. 7½" × 5¼". Pp. vi+114. Ginn. Cloth [no price].
- Junks* (E. A.) An Index of the Adverbs of Terence. St. Andrew's University Publications, No. XII. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 32. Oxford: University Press, 1915. 2s. 6d. net.
- Lindsay* (W. M.) A Short Historical Latin Grammar (Second Edition). 7½" × 5". Pp. xii+224. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 5s. 6d.
- Lobham* (W.) Latin Verb Paradigms. 9" × 6". Pp. 32. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1915. 1s. net.
- Marchant* (E. C.) Books of Britain and the Emperors. I.: Julius Caesar to Agricola. 6¾" × 4¾". Pp. 96. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1915. Cloth, 1s.
- Ovid* (Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto, Halientica, Fragmenta). Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. 7½" × 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 3s.
- Persson* (Axel W.) Zur Textgeschichte Xenophoris. 9¾" × 6¾". Pp. 176. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association, January, 1915* (Vol. XII.). 8½" × 5½". Pp. 132. London: John Murray, 1915. 2s. 6d. net.
- Robertson* (G.) An Introduction to Greek Reading. 6¾" × 4½". Pp. xii+113. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Simmonds* (D.) In Caesarem Gulielmum oratio. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 11. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons, 2d.
- Ussani* (V.) Note alla Fedra di Seneca. 9½" × 6¼". Pp. 28. Naples: Tipografia Cimmaruta.
- Valeton* (M.) De Iliadis fontibus et compositione. 9¼" × 6". Pp. 340. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1915. Gulden 3.50.
- White* (John Williams). The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes, with an Introduction on the Origin, Development, Transmission, and Extant Sources of the old Greek Commentary on his Writings. 9" × 6¼". Pp. cxii+378. Ginn. Cloth [no price].

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SOME EMENDATIONS OF THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

In Apoll. 337:

αὐτοὶ νῦν μὲν παντες ἀκούσατε. It is doubtful if a satisfactory sense can be given to αὐτοὶ: perhaps αὐτόθε, 'straight-way.'

In Herm. 109:

δάφνης ἀγλαὸν ὄζον { ἐνίαλλε } σιδήρῳ
ἐλῶν { ἐπέλεψε }

Professor Postgate's theory that M's ἐνίαλλε represents an original λείαινε seems palaeographically overbold, and the hard and appropriate word ἐπέλεψε can hardly be anything but genuine; it is perhaps more probable that M's singular variant gives the actual verb used in the line lost after 109, to express the application of the τρύπανον to the στορεύς, and has been accidentally preserved through its intrusion into 109.

In Herm. 116:

τόφρα δ' ὑποβρυχίας ἔλικας βοῦς εἴλκε
θύραζε.

ὑποβρυχίας lies under a double suspicion, as the adjective everywhere else means 'under water,' and even if it could be derived from βρυχάομαι, the -υ- of this verb and its cognates is always long. Hence Ludwich conjectures ὑποβρύχους, but why should the oxen, whom the poet has called ἐριμύκους in 74 and 105, now be 'bellowing in a low tone'?

Rather should we not write ὑπὸ βρυχαῖς 'to the sound of bellowing'?—It is true that βρυχή is not used in this

sense in our extant remains of epic till Oppian (*Hal.* 2. 530), but the analogy of βρυχαόμαι makes it probable that this is a mere accident. The corruption of ΤΠΟΒΡΤΧΑΙC to ΤΠΟΒΡΤΧΙΑC will be due to the chance resemblance to ὑποβρύχιος.

In Herm. 133:

περῆν }
πέρην } ἱερῆς κατὰ δειρήs
πέρην' }

περᾶν Barnes: περῆν' Clarke: περ εἶν' Mr. Allen: of these the first two are unacceptable as sense, and the third unluckily gives a halting metre. Perhaps παρεῖν?—'to let it go down his throat'; cp. Plat. *Phaed.* 90 E, μὴ παρίωμεν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν. The corruption seems to have arisen after the identity of παρεῖναι had been obscured by elision: scribes to whom the sounds of εἰ and η were practically indistinguishable altered it to the familiar πέρην. Messrs. Sikes and Allen make some attempts to defend πέρην, but the word adds little to the sense, and the variants remain unaccounted for.

In Herm. 159:

If μεταξὺ needs alteration—and certainly something in the sense 'ever afterwards' would be more natural—we should expect μέτασσα on the pattern of 125 rather than μέταζε. Such a rare word might easily suffer alteration.

In Herm. 346:

αὐτὸς δ' οὗτος ὅδ' ἐκτός. I am interested to note that Mr. Evelyn White (*C. R.* xxviii. 222) has hit independently upon a correction of this line analogous to mine. I had thought of αὐτὸς δ' αὖθ' ὁδοῦ ἐκτός. Is not the meaning that where Hermes deserts the beaten road and crosses the ψαμαθώδης χῶρος, where his tracks become visible, they are seen to be of this unearthly kind?

In Herm. 409-410:

περίστρεφε καρτερὰ δεσμά
ἄγνον· ταὶ δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶ κατὰ χθονὸς
αἶψα φύοντο

To avoid the false concord δεσμά . . . ταὶ Baumeister supposes a lacuna between 409 and 410, alleging 'the need of a full description of Apollo's attempt to bind Hermes' in support of his guess. It is intolerable that the description of the material of the bonds should be deferred for two or three lines in this fashion: the lacuna would in any case have to follow ἄγνον. But the whole hypothesis seems unnecessary, if we write ἄγνους for ἄγνον, in apposition to δεσμά, 'around his hands he twined stout bonds, withes.' The change of this to ἄγνον was naturally made to clarify the sense, in defiance of ταὶ. (Franke's ἄγνων is palaeographically unlikely and affords no motive for corruption.) And there is no real deficiency in the sense: the description of the exactly similar miracle worked by Dionysus in vii. 13 is just as laconic. The wonder gains in impressiveness by the absence of mechanical accessories: the god's will is enough. Messrs. Sikes and Allen's suggestion that 'Hermes enchanted the δεσμά with his lyre' is unlucky, for l. 409 expressly says that his hands were bound.

In Herm. 436:

βουφόνε μηχανιώτα πονεύμενε δαιτὸς
ἐταῖρε

The difficulties that have been found in πονεύμενε and δαιτὸς ἐταῖρε can, I think, be solved simultaneously if we write—

βουφόνε, μηχανιώτα πονεύμενε δαιτὸς
ἐταίρης

'Ox-killer, busy deviser of our banqueting-companion.' δαιτὸς ἐταῖρε is here, to say the least of it, obscure; and as the lyre is the topic of conversation, a comparison with 31 and 478 leaves little doubt that δαιτὸς ἐταίρη in some form or other is original. Hermes is πονεύμενος in virtue of his inventions of the lyre itself (25 sqq.), of sandals (80 sqq.), of the πυρεῖα and fire (111): indeed the central theme of the whole composition, if any, is surely the busy wit of Hermes, and such emendations as Schneidewin's πολεούμενε really weaken the sense.

In Herm. 473:

τῶν νῦν αὐτὸς ἔγωγε παῖδ' ἀφνειὸν
δεδάηκα

Emendation of this passage has always proceeded on the line that the object of δεδάηκα must be σε and that this is concealed in ἔγωγε, the general sense being, 'I know that you are wealthy in lore of this kind.'

To this there are clear objections; σοὶ δ' at the opening of 474, which should mark a contrast from its emphatic position, loses point: it becomes difficult to extract a meaning for νῦν, and, most serious of all, δάημι is assigned a sense which it cannot bear in the line following, nor anywhere in this hymn (cp. 444, 471, 483), nor perhaps anywhere in the language, and to govern an unparalleled construction. By all accounts, we should expect δεδάηκα to = 'I am versed in an art,' and its lost object was probably something like 'knowledge of music.' Again, σοὶ δ' in 474 seems meant to point a contrast; and this is confirmed where the line recurs (489 *infr.*), where it is so contrasted with the νῆϊς of 487 and 488. On the strength of these indications we might emend the present line—

τῶν νῦν αὐτὸς ἔγωγ', ἔτι παῖς, ἄφενος
δεδάηκα,

'Of this art I myself have indeed learnt good store, for the child that I yet am: but as for thee, thou canst have any knowledge soever for the wishing.' ἄφενος (cp. *in Dem.* 489) appears to have been regarded by copyists as an adjective governing παῖς: the line thus seemed

to lack an object, and *παῖδ' ἄφενον* and *ἄφνειόν* were in turn substituted. Metrical considerations then ousted *ἔτι*, the *ε* being absorbed in *ἔγωγε* and *τι* lost before *παῖς*. Professor Tyrrell's *πεδ' ἄφνειῶν* imposes an inconceivable freak of dialect on the poet who has given us *μετὰ* in 126, 164, 291, etc.

In *Herm.* 486:

ἐργασίην { φεύγουσα } δυνήπαθον·
 { φθέγγουσα }

The context leaves little doubt that *ἐργασίην* bears the sense here of 'practising music,' which its use elsewhere would lead us to expect. But if so, *φεύγουσα* cannot be right. The sense we require is 'providing consolation for the pains spent on practice.' *φέγγουσα*, 'glorifying,' will then be apposite (*φέγγω λαμπρύνω*, Hesych.). The variant *φθέγγουσα* is due to the influence of *φθεγγομένη* in 484, while *φεύγουσα* is the nearest simple word substituted for the hard *φέγγουσα* by someone who perhaps thought it might mean 'avoiding, shunning toil.'

In *Arhr.* 17-18:

οὐδέ ποτ' Ἀρτέμιδα . . .
δάμναται . . . φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφρο-
δίτη· 17
καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε τόξα καὶ οὐρεσι
θήρας ἐναίρειν 18
φόρμιγγές τε χοροί τε διαπρύσιοί
τ' ὀλολυγαὶ . . . 19

So all MSS. but M; in 18 M has: *πουλύχρυσα δὲ τόξα* for *καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε τόξα*. It is clear that neither of these variants can be mere blunders, and Mr. Allen accordingly proposes:

καὶ τῇ ἄδε [παρθενίη μὲν τ' ἀγα-
μή τε] 18
πουλύχρυσα δὲ τόξα κ.τ.λ. 18A

Parablepsia will then give the version of most MSS., but what of M? We can hardly suppose that a coincidence of the letters A Δ E in the middle of the lines led to the entire loss of 18; also *μὲν . . .* *δέ . . .* is a contrast without point.

The variations will be accounted for, I think, if we conjecture:

οὐ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε [ἔργα πολυχρύσου
Ἀφροδίτης (cp. 1) 18
πουλύχρυσα δὲ τόξα κ.τ.λ. 18A

The Vulgate version then arose: (i.) from the homoeoteuton Ἀφροδίτη, Ἀφροδίτης of 17 and 18; (ii.) the recurring epithet πολυχρύσου, πουλύχρυσα; (iii.) the coincidence of A Δ E in 18 and 18A. M's version is due to the homoeoteuton (i.).

I write ἄδε ἔργα of set purpose: it will be noticed throughout this hymn that the digamma of ἔργα has its force in all passages where change did not offer itself readily (in 1, 10, 11, 15); wherever an -ν ἐφέλκυστικόν, was handy, it has been inserted (in 6, 9, 21, 122). This looks like the patching of a late rhapsode. Should we then write *πάσι δὲ ἔργα* (6), *εὐαδε ἔργα* (9), *ἄδε ἔργα* (18, 21), *ἡγαγε ἔργα* (122)? Similarly, why not *ἦρπασε ὄν* in 203 (with A E Γ and the virtual support of p D, which have *ἦρπασ' ἔδν*)? Hermann's *ἦρπασεν ὄν* can scarcely have caused such perturbations in the tradition. But this is dangerous ground.

In *Arhr.* 136 and 136A:

M and MSS. of the x family offer—

οὐ σφιν ἀικελήη νυὸς ἔσσομαι,
ἀλλ' εἰκνῖα 136
εἴ τοι ἀικελήη γυνή ἔσσομαι ἢ ἐ
καὶ οὐκί. 136A

The p family has the valueless conflation—

οὐ σφιν ἀικελήη γυνή ἔσσομαι ἢ καὶ
οὐκί.

But how are we to choose between the remaining alternatives, and how did they originate? Flach observes that the neglect of the digamma in *εἰκνῖα* seems to decide for 136A, and as this digamma is observed in 153 *infr.*, his objection has force. On the other hand, it is hard to believe that *τοι* and *γυνή* can be original and *σφιν* and *νυὸς* late substitutes. At the same time, it is equally hard to believe that *εἰκνῖα* is a late substitute for *ἢ καὶ οὐκί*. If these contentions hold good, we have no alternative but to construct a single verse out of the two. Ruhnken's attempt can hardly be thought satisfactory; rather—

εἴ σφιν ἀικελήη νυὸς ἔσσομαι ἢ εἰκνῖα,

'Show me to thy father and mother, (to see) if I shall make them an ill-pleasing daughter-in-law or a well-

sued.' Then (i.) the elliptical construction and the apparent hiatus caused later rhapsodies to concoct the substitute 136 (MSS.' version); (ii.) 136A is due to a corruption of ἡ εἰκυῖα to ἡ καὶ οὐκί. The line thus evolved does not present any difficulties beyond those of the MS. version of 136A.

In *Aphr.* 252:

νῦν δὲ δὴ οὐκέτι μοι †στοναχῆσεται
ἐξονομῆναι
τοῦτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισι κ.τ.λ.

The usually received conjecture, and indeed the only one worthy of notice, is Martin's στόμα χεῖσεται. But χεῖσεται cannot bear the sense required of it. Mr. E. Harrison, who has been kind enough to give me the benefit of his opinion, says: 'χεῖσεται is wrong. *Il.* Δ 462 = "as loud as his head would hold": nonsense here.'

I would suggest στόμα χ' ἦσεται . . . , an ironical meiosis; 'scarce likely is it that my tongue will delight to name this thing hereafter.' The middle short subjunctive form is warranted by *Od.* L 353, ἦσατο (innocent of a digamma). At the same time there is a doubt about its construction with an infinitive: Aesch. *Eum.* 312, cited by L and S, is an inferior conjecture. The objection does not seem insuperable, for ἦδομαι with a dative is familiar, and the infinitive mood is 'a verbal substantive most commonly in the dative case': it will scarcely then be a violent step to assume the construction without authority. But as Mr. Harrison suggests to me, στόμα χ' ἦσεται ἐξονομῆναν would be but a slight extra change.

In *Aphr.* 284:

φασίν τοι νύμφης καλυκώπιδος ἔκγονον
εἶναι . . .

If any alteration of φασίν is needed, φάς μιν might be more acceptable than Matthiae's φάσθαι; 'do thou remember and speak as I bid thee, saying that he. . . .' But there is humour in the MS. text which it is a pity to spoil.

In *Dionys.* (VII.) 43:

οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες
μή δ' ἤδη (M) } τότ' ἔπειτα κυβερνήτην
μηδὲ δειν } ἐκέλευον
μὴ δεῖδεν }
γῆ πελάαν·

We have to deal with ΜΗΔΗΔΗ. νῆ' ἤδη τότ' ἔπειτα Hermann, but (i.) νῆα is in a misleading position far from its governing verb: our first instinct would be to connect it with ἰδόντες; (ii.) ἤδη τότ' ἔπειτα is a phrase without authority, and δὴ τότ' ἔπειτα always stands at the beginning of clause. Possibly then: οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | μῆδεα, δὴ τότ' ἔπειτα κ.τ.λ. For πελάαν intransitive cp. *Il.* M 112, *Od.* μ. 41. 'But they, when they beheld Dionysus' pranks, straightway bade the helmsman make for land.' Corrupted by dittography.

X. 2-3:

ἐφ' ἱμερτῶ δὲ προσώπῳ
αἰεὶ μειδιάει { ἐφ' ἱμερτὸν } θέει } ἄνθος.
καὶ { ἐφ' ἱμερτὸν } φέρει }

Noticeable in these lines are (i.) the repetition ἐφ' ἱμερτῶ, ἐφ' ἱμερτὸν—unpointed, and suspiciously like a dittography; (ii.) the fact that in 3, the first hand in M has ἐφ' ἱμερτῶ, ΕΠΣ ἐφ' ἱμερτὸν; (iii.) the variants θέει M, φέρει the rest. Possibly these will be accounted for if we suppose that l. 3 formerly ran: αἰεὶ μειδιάει καὶ ἐφ' ἱμερτὸν ἀνθέει ἄνθος (cp. *Arroll.* 139, ἦνθησ' ὥς ὅτε τε ῥίον οὖρεος ἄνθεσιν ὕλης: hymn XXIII. δάρους δαρίξει, *Od.* λ 26, etc.). The dittography ἐφ' ἱμερτὸν has caused the ousting of the first syllable of ἀνθέει metri gratiā in M: in the other MSS. ἀνθέει has fallen out before ἄνθος, and its place has been supplied by the bald φέρει.

Id. 4-5:

χαῖρε μάκαιρα Κυθήρης εὐκτιμένης με-
δέουσα
εἰναλῆς τε Κύπρου . . . So M.
χαῖρε θεά, Σαλαμῖνος εὐκτιμένης μεδέ-
ουσα
καὶ πάσης Κύπρου . . . the rest.

Messrs. Sikes and Allen adopt the version of the generality of MSS. in 4, but M.'s εἰναλῆς τε Κύπρου in 5. The result is weird—as if we were to talk about the 'King of London and of sea-girt England.' The variants strongly suggest that we have here two versions of the hymn—an older one native to the Cypriote Salamis, and running, 'queen of stout-built Salamis and all this isle of Cyprus,' and another when the hymn was adapted by later rhapsodes to suit any part of Greece—the manipulation

leaving its mark in the barbarous rhythm of the recast line 4.

XIX. 40:

τὸν δ' αἰψ' Ἑρμείας ἐριούνιος εἰς χέρα
θῆκε
δεξάμενος . . .

Εἰς χέρα θῆκε is certainly a strange expression, as Messrs. Sikes and Allen remark, for 'took the child into his arms'—stranger still, as we are told that he had already 'received' it—and can hardly be sound. Köchly's wild shot εἶλε makes the tautology worse than before. Perhaps εἰς χέρ' ἀθρήσε | δεξάμενος: an error of wrong division in the first instance, and weak tinkering afterwards.

XXIV. 4:

ἔρχεο τόνδ' ἀνὰ οἶκον, ἐπέρχεο θυμὸν
ἔχουσα.

The solemn intensive repetition of the verb fits the tone of this invocation very well, but what are we to make of θυμὸν ἔχουσα? The adjective in this phrase regularly precedes, and emendations of ἐπέρχεο do not convince; ἔν' ἔρχεο would infallibly have appeared as ἐνέρχεο if corrupted. θύμα λαχοῦσα has also been suggested, but we look for an appeal to the goddess to be gracious (cp. xxix. 10), and Pindar's formula of prayer, θυμὸν θέλων (*Isthm.* v. 43, to accept D's pal-

pably sound reading of the passage: θυμῷ of B is a simplification, the more so as the MSS. have corrupted ἀρᾶν in the same sentence into an accusative) might suggest θυμὸν ἐκοῦσα here—corruption being due to the influence of the stereotyped phrase (e.g. *Ap̄hr.* 102). But it must be admitted that the construction, though it may stand in lyric, is harsh for epic writing.

XXXI. 13:

καλὸν δὲ περὶ χροῖ λάμπεται ἔσθος
λεπτουργές πνοιῇ ἀνέμων. . .

It is possible to construe these lines by taking πνοιῇ ἀνέμων as dependent in sense on λάμπεται, 'Shines in the wind,' but the expression savours more of Vergil than of the style of this hymn. λεπτουργές and πνοιῇ suggest the tossing of a charioteer's robe in the wind; can the original have run:

περὶ χροῖ ἀμπετᾶ ἔσθος
λεπτουργές πνοιῇ ἀνέμων

(hiatus before Bucolic diaeresis)—'and around his form the wind tosses his fine-spun drapery'? πετάω lacks early authority, but that need not be fatal in this late and possibly Alexandrian hymn. The blunder was likely in a context as full of λαμπρός (10, 12), etc., as this.

R. J. SHACKLE.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE FOURTH FOOT OF THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER.

FOR the caesura after the fourth trochee, and breaches, in a Westminster Version and in the Ode to Professor Ridgeway, of the rule forbidding it, Mr. Gaselee (*supra*, p. 48) might have referred to the notes by Professor Tyrrell and Dr. Hayman in *C.R.* XVII. 365 and XVIII. 226. Such a caesura not infrequently appears in Greek hexameter and elegiac compositions. In a recent epigram¹ one hexameter ends, ποτέρου δὲ τὸ δῶρον ἄρειον, and to some that is a clear case.

How far can the veto on verses with

this caesura be considered a rule for Homer, the 'father of the rest,' and the model that composers generally emulate? In other words, are fourth trochees many or few in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*? Professor Tyrrell (*l.c.*) went so far as to say that he did not believe that from the two poems two sound verses could be adduced with such a caesura, except when the verse ends with a polysyllable, and that the only one in which such a caesura may not be avoided by a very simple correction seemed to be *Od.* xii. 47, ἐπὶ δ' οὔατ' ἀλεῖψαι ἑταίρων. And even there a determined expurgator might say the elision cures the defect.

¹ 'In Memoriam W. G. C. G.' (*The Times*, April 17, 1915).

This dictum appears to be too sweeping. The discussion of the question, with exhaustive enumeration, which is usually referred to is van Leeuwen's in *Mnemos*, XVIII. 265 ff., condensed (and altered) in his *Enchiridium*, 18 ff. From this it appears that there are a number of lines which certainly exhibit this caesura. Attempts have, of course, been made to 'correct' most of them; but some resist, and van Leeuwen, in his paper in *Mnemosyne*, avoided, in several cases, the Charybdis of the fourth trochee only to fall into the Scylla of Wernicke.¹ It must be admitted that there are some ineradicable cases in the poems.

And the enumeration in question shows that there are really more instances than those included in this unyielding residuum. These are explained away, some as inexcusable, others as only apparent. Thus, in one class of cases the effect of the final polysyllable is relied on, and *στέρνον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι* and *ἐμοῖσι κασιγνήτοισι* are not objected to. But as it is not suggested by van Leeuwen or any other authority that the polysyllable helps to palliate the objectionable element, whatever that may be, in a fourth trochee, how can he say that it renders the passages in question 'to some extent tolerable?' It has no doubt occurred to some who have wondered what there might be in this polysyllable, that the excuse is based on the length of the word, which makes it difficult *ἐφάρμοζεν ἑξαμέτρῳ*. But as *Ποσειδάωνι* (-ος, -α) and *κασιγνήτοισι*, and many other words of the same metrical value, are found frequently in other positions, and are final in only ten cases, the difficulty in accommodating them does not warrant resort to a scansion that is essentially vicious. Homer uses even longer words without detriment to the metre.

But there are many other lines which may be construed as containing a fourth trochaic. In regard to these it is argued that there is no caesura at all. In one

set, the connection between a short or shortly scanned monosyllable, forming the last syllable of the trochee, and the syllable that follows it is said to be so close that they must be pronounced without a pause or ictus-rest between them; and so, it is explained, there is no break in the line. A common case is one in which *καί* is concerned. In the hemistich *σκήπτρον καὶ ἀεικέα πήρην* we are to scan *σκήπτρον | καὶ ᾰ-*, not *σκήπτρον καὶ | ᾰ-*, and as *καί* is generally taken to be *προκλιτικώτατον*, this is no doubt correct, though surely the *καί* in such expressions adheres closely also to the word that precedes it.² So with certain prepositions in the same position in the verse. These, it is said, *ad sequentia trahuntur* in such combinations as *φέρων ἄν' ὄμιλον ἀπάντη* or *νεῶν ἐν ἁγῶνι πεσόντα*. The preposition is treated as practically inseparable from the word it governs. But Dr. Leaf, when considering some violations of Wernicke's Law (*Iliad*, vol. ii. 636), tells us that the connection of the Homeric preposition with its case is loose, and it is not always easy to say whether the preposition is in closer union with the word that follows or with the verb or other word that precedes. But in addition to this a difficulty arises. We have, though more rarely, the same species of combination in the third foot—*προπάροιθε πυλάων, τῆλε νεός*, or even *πόντῳ ἐν*. If there is practically a coalescence of preposition and noun in such phrases in the fourth foot, we must hold the same about them when they occur in the third, and give up in the latter case the most characteristic rhythm of the Homeric hexameter. Lines containing the common break in the third foot must be converted into hephthemimerals or worse. The reply will be, presumably, that that result must be accepted, but it is a question if such a metrical construction of these third trochees has ever occurred to any one.

The same may be said of another

¹ Just as Wordsworth, in discussing fourth spondaics in Theocritus (Preface, x), gets rid of two by boldly rearranging the lines so as to produce fourth trochaics.

² The fact that the diphthong of *καί* remains uncorrupted in some cases in the Bucolic Diaeresis—as, *ἀγανός καὶ ἦπιος ἔστω*—seems to show that a rest after the conjunction is not precluded.

considerable class. In these an enclitic makes a fourth trochee with a preceding long syllable, and the phrase which the trochee forms or ends is said to be attached so intimately to the word that follows, that no break is felt. Thus, in a case like *ὡς εἵ τε πατήρ*, it appears to be affirmed that there can be no pause or rest after the *τε* in the utterance of the whole phrase. Then the same must surely be said of these four words when they occur, as they do, in the middle of the line. And so in other instances. If there is no caesura in *ἐπεὶ κε τέκωσι* (fourth), there can be none in *οὐ μὲν γάρ κε δάμη* or *οὐ γάρ κεν ὑπέκφυγον* (third). And the same may be said of *Τρῳσὶν τε καὶ Ἑκτορι δῖω* or *λιγύς περ ἑών* (fourth) compared with *ἄλοχός τε καὶ ὑπερεφές* and *γυμνόν περ ἑόντ'*, respectively (third).

And how far are we to extend this principle? van Leeuwen would even condone such cases as *ἐγὼ γε νεώτερός εἰμι* and *ἐγὼ δὲ δόλους πολυτεύω*. These can be paralleled in the third foot, where probably no one has ever thought of denying a rest at the enclitic. That being so, a rest is possible after the enclitic in the fourth foot. He also excuses a case of adverb and verb. But if the two words *ὀψὲ δύοντα* *arte coherent* in the fourth foot, the same may be said of *ἰθὺς ἐλαύνετε, τόσσον ἐχώσατο* and similar combinations in the third. And must we not go on to adjectives and nouns, to verbs and their objects, and to other similar combinations? If we once go beyond the enclitics and perhaps *δέ* and *καί*, it will be hard to say where we should draw the line. Many third trochees will vanish. Possibly those who are bent on abolishing the fourth trochee out of Homer will say, let them vanish. But others will protest. It seems to be a question between grammar and rhythm. Must not the former yield? Greek and English verse may not be *in pari materia*, but at least the following lines from one of Swinburne's odes will illustrate the point. Are we to read them with strict regard to orthoepy based on the close grammatical connection apparent in every one of them, or with the obviously intended rhythm and rest?

Sea and strand, and a lordlier land | than sea-
tides rolling and rising sun
Clasp and lighten in climes that brighten | with
day when day that was here is done,
Call aloud on their children, proud | with trust
that future and past are one.

The brief rest due to the ictus does no violence to the sense.

The rule which bears the name of 'Wernicke's Law' is another which is at times disregarded by composers. In the Ridgeway Ode one hexameter ends *ἀγοραῖσιν κυδιανείραις*. Purists would object to that as a particularly bad violation, though it has two parallels in Homer, *ὑπερθευ δὲ σκολόπεσσι* (*Il.* xiii. 55), and *ἐπέεσσιν πειρηθῆναι* (*Od.* xxiv. 240), but possibly the author would agree with Mr. Agar in denying the rule for Homer. It has been well discussed in the *Classical Review*; see X. 43 f., XI. 29 ff., and 151 ff. Dr. Leaf sums up in App. N. to his *Iliad*, and saves remnants of the law by accepting certain modifications of its terms as usually stated. But his investigation seems to be open to remarks of much the same kind as those passed on van Leeuwen's disquisition. Thus we are to regard *ἄλλος λαός* 'almost as a single word.' But has any one ever suggested that about *κεῖνος* or *οὗτος ἀνὴρ* or *οἶκος ὅδ'* in the third foot? Again, if an elided vowel helps to annul the effect of a pause in the Bucolic Diaeresis, so it must in a combination of words in the third foot such as *μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς*. We shall really be compelled, in many instances, to revise our notions regarding the main break in the hexameter. For the *βοώπις* cases Dr. Leaf seems to have authority on his side, but *γλαυκῶπις* leaves a doubt. It hardly seems sufficient ground for rejecting Bentley's *Τιταρησόν* and *Αἰτωλόν* (*Il.* ii. 751 and v. 706), that they 'introduce a license which is far less usual than a violation of the digamma,' for the opportunities for the former are immensely fewer than those for the latter. 'The rule of the molossus,' to which there are a number of exceptions that cannot be explained away,¹ can hardly be regarded

¹ Professor Platt (*Journ. Phil.* xviii. 120 ff.) gets rid of genitives in *-ov* by resolving into *-oo*. But see Mr. Drewitt in *Amer. Journ. Phil.*

as authority for questioning *Κηφισόν* in *Il.* ii. 522. Bentley's *Κηφισοῦ* seems to have been accepted by nobody. And a doubtful distinction is drawn between a final syllable long in itself by position, and one long by position due to a consonant in the following word. There are, in short, a number of obstructive instances in the *Iliad*. The *Odyssey* is in like case, and apparently the expurgation of the 'exceptions' in it has not been attempted.

Mr. Agar, it has been said, denies that the law applies to Homer. He believes that the objection to the rhythm in question, which is scrupulously observed by, for instance, Apollonius Rhodius, was a late invention, and imposed on Homer in later times by alteration of the text; and, in support of that view, he shows (*C.R.* XI. 29 ff.) that in a number of cases breaches of the 'law' which were in the text originally can be restored with little difficulty. Dr. Leaf dismisses these 'conjectural "emendations"' with a word, but Professor Platt thought there was 'a great deal to be said' for many of them (*ibid.* XI. 15), and Mr. Barnett (*ibid.* XIII. 208) appears to accept them without demur. Many conjectural emendations have been received into the Homeric text, and quite a number of these have been confirmed by the discovery of new MSS. It is a question of evidence, and Mr. Agar's changes are generally reasonable. The violations of the 'law' which are thus introduced, and those which, in spite of Dr. Leaf's statement, must be considered to be in the poems already, together constitute a fairly formidable body of instances.

It is surely better to allow such departures from general practice, and not to seek, by doubtful expedients, to force refinements of the laws of Homeric rhythm. Attempts have been made to clear the Bucolic Diaeresis of another irregularity, the non-correction of a final long vowel or diphthong, but these Dr. Leaf discountenances. That the poet or poets did not like a trochee in the fourth foot, and preferred, when it

ended with a word, to make the last syllable long by nature, may be admitted; but apparently that is all that can be said. A more interesting question is why there should have been this dislike. As regards the fourth trochee, anyone who has made hexameters for himself knows that it constitutes an unpleasantness, and one which a polysyllable at the end of the line, or an *ἐπεὶ κε* or a *ὥς εἴ τε* does not remove or mitigate. He who writes down a hexameter with such a fourth foot, and does not at once perceive that it is faulty, may be said not to have a good ear. But why does a trochee at that particular point make a verse halt, when it has not that effect elsewhere? A satisfactory answer does not appear to have been given. Witte, in his discussion in *Glotta*, iv. 9, does not attempt one. He only finds the explanation of the rarity of fourth trochees in the origin of the hexameter, but is not quite successful. He seems to claim more knowledge of the original compounds of the hexameter than can be granted him. Dr. Leaf (*l.c.* 635, and cf. Mr. Drewitt in *C.Q.* ii. 104) explains both rules in the same way; the hearer must not think the line is closed. But could he think the line had closed when he had heard only two-thirds of it, when he was only a foot and a half beyond the middle of the line as indicated by an almost universal caesura, and at a point where the line is as it were gathering itself for the final effort to the close? That seems unlikely, not to say impossible. If a marked pause, as contrasted with an habitual rest, were frequent after the fourth spondee, there might be some ground for the idea. But it is not; on the contrary, such a pause is rare. There are in the poems about 2,960 fourth spondaics, and, if one may judge from a count for *Iliad* i.-xii., there are probably not more than 160 of these in which there is a pause that justifies a punctuation mark of any description. Still, that there was, as Dr. Leaf says, 'some special influence at work at this particular point of the line,' seems proved by the figures he gives. What that influence was has yet, it would appear, to be discovered. Mr. Barnett,

in trying to explain, has to manipulate the text a good deal. A final explanation of these supposed canons will have to go deep. Meantime the modern composer who *Homerum studet aemulari* had better perhaps observe them. If his disregard of them is frequent, his title to be considered 'Ὀμηρικώτατος' will be impugned.

Both rules were more carefully regarded, it is said, 'in later Greek,' but

just when strict observance became general has not been determined. It may be remarked of Theognis and Theocritus—the latter when not βωκολιασδόμενος—that, allowing, of course, for the much smaller number of their hexameters, they seem to be in very much the same case as Homer. In this connection Wordsworth's discussion already referred to and some of his notes *a.l.* are of interest.

A. SHEWAN.

HERODOTUS AND BABYLON.

IN my recent volume on Ancient Town-planning¹ I had to consider the case of Babylon as the oldest example of anything like town-planning within the Greek horizon. I was thus confronted with the contrast between the actual remains of Babylon and the account given by Herodotus and reinforced by other ancient writers. I was led to a theory which partially reconciles the two, and this theory I should like to state anew for the consideration of Herodotean students. Since I set it forth in my book, it has been mentioned by Koldewey in his recent account of Babylon²; it may have occurred to others, of whom I do not know.

Herodotus describes Babylon as a square, nearly 14 miles each way, girt with brick walls 90 feet thick and 340 feet high, and entered through a hundred gates—presumably, twenty-five in each side. The square was cut diagonally by the Euphrates, and the river-banks were lined by walls of less strength than those just mentioned. The city within the walls had straight streets, some of them at right angles to the others, some leading to small gates in the river-walls. This suggests town-planning clearly enough. Equally clearly, the dimensions are incredible. Koldewey observes

that certain types of semi-civilised cities reach vast sizes. But, as I had already pointed out, the walls of Nanking, the largest city-site in that empire of large



towns, China, measured (or measure) less than 24 miles right round and less than 70 feet in height.

The remains of Babylon actually show, on the left or east bank of the Euphrates, an area of town-life enclosed by an Inner and an Outer Wall (plan). The Outer Wall is about 5 miles long. It makes with the river a huge triangle of which the base (the river bank) must have been nearly 3 miles long, if we assume (as the evidence suggests) that it ran straighter then than to-day. Within the town contained by this triangle were palaces, temples and houses; a stately broad processional

¹ *Ancient Town Planning* (Clarendon Press, 1913). The Delegates of the Press have kindly lent me the block of the plan of Babylon for the figure which illustrates this article.

² *The Excavations at Babylon* (London, 1914).

avenue connected palaces and temples; from this main street others diverged at right angles, and in the Merkes quarter were private houses which (according to plans published by Koldewey since I wrote) exhibit somewhat rude *insulae*. The river front was walled; bridges crossed it to the other (right) bank of the Euphrates. On that other bank were also walls and houses—among other things, a town-wall enclosing a small rectangle and corresponding somewhat to the Inner Wall of the left bank. The extent of this right-bank city is still uncertain; one would think that it was not nearly as large or as important as the opposite city which contained the palaces and temples of Babylon's kings and gods.

Such are the remains, as known at present. It is plain that those of the left bank show a city smaller than, yet not unlike, one half of the Herodotean city. It is large enough to have seemed to a Greek to 'have the compass of a nation rather than of a city'; it is of a size about which (as Aristotle hints) legends easily arose (*Pol.* III. 1276). The latest editors of Herodotus, Wells and How, decided that this could not be the Herodotean city, because it had walls only on two sides and its river front was unprotected. It is never safe to argue that an ancient wall (or anything else) did not exist, merely because it has not yet been found. It may never have been looked for. In this case the river wall had not been looked for. When, quite lately, the excavators came to look for it, they found it.

No doubt the half-city shown by excavation is on a far smaller scale than half of the Herodotean city. Even if we could suppose on the right bank a walled area equal to that proved on the left, the whole compass of the walls would not match one side in the Herodotean square. But the coincidence between (1) the existence of the proven triangular half-square on the left bank, with traces of something more not yet explored on the right bank, and (2) the division of the Herodotean city into two triangular half-squares by the river, cannot be altogether accident. Consider the position of Herodotus when he visited Babylon—as scholars seem to agree that he did. He was a stranger in a vast expanse of buildings which, in extent and in magnificence, surpassed any Greek city of his day. He had no plans and no instruments. His guides had no doubt the Oriental sense of distance, and he himself cannot have aimed at that accuracy in dimensions which we expect to-day. It is notoriously rash to trust the figures of armies or casualties given by ancient writers—or indeed, for that matter, by some of our own contemporaries. They are often grossly high. It is no less rash to trust statements about feet and furlongs. Herodotus had to convey to his readers the notion of a city very far greater than he or his readers could have seen elsewhere—and he did it. Nor is it necessary to think that he deliberately lied in order to do it.

F. HAVERFIELD.

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN PLATO'S *LAWS*.

Laws 643 D-E. Most editors assume that *καπηλείας καὶ ναυκληρίας* are accusatives plural, but none of the restorations, based on this assumption, is satisfactory. It is better, therefore, to regard the words (with Stephanus) as genitives singular, and to restore the passage by writing εἰς <τά> τε καπηλείας κ.τ.λ. Cp. the confusion of τε and τότε in 698 C, and of το and τότε in 713 C. Further, in the same sentence the accusative singular πεπαιδευμένον . . . ἀνθ-

ρωπον seems preferable to the genitive plural given by the best MSS., in view of the frequency of similar errors in case-endings in the MSS. of the *Laws*.

Ibid. 668 A. οὐ γὰρ εἰ τῷ δοκεῖ ἢ μή τις χαίρει τῷ, τό γε ἴσον ἴσον οὐδὲ τὸ σύμμετρον ἂν εἴη σύμμετρον ὅλως. Evidently the μή is here, as Stallbaum saw, *ineptum*; and it is silently dropped by Jowett. Possibly it arose from a confusion of compendia ($\eta = \mu$), and ought

to be ἡμῶν (see Bast s.v.) But it is not enough to amputate the μή; if the editors had done their duty they would have applied similar treatment to the second τῷ. Either it should be cut out or we should read χαίρει, τοῦτ' ὅ γε ἴσον κ.τ.λ.

Ibid. 679 D. καὶ ὅσαι δὴ κατὰ πόλιν μόνον αὐτοῦ, δίκαι καὶ στάσεις λεγόμεναι, λόγοις κ.τ.λ. Burnet's punctuation here is barely intelligible, for what are we to make of μόνον αὐτοῦ? Jowett connects κατὰ πόλιν closely with λεγόμεναι, but discreetly drops μόνον αὐτοῦ; Stallbaum puts the comma after μόνον. The construction only becomes clear when we observe—as Jowett certainly did not—that the point of the clause lies in the allusion to the familiar distinction between πόλεμος and στάσις (*cf.* *Rep.* 470 B, *Laws* 628 B, 629 D), since with ὅσαι we have to supply πολεμικαὶ τέχναι. Hence we must punctuate after πόλιν, and explain μόνον as drawing attention to the peculiarity of city-dialect, στάσις in place of πολεμικὴ τέχνη.

Ibid. 715 C. τοῦτ' ὅ φησιν καὶ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ὑπηρεσίαν δοτέον εἶναι κ.τ.λ. Evidently θεῶν is wrong, but neither Orelli's θεσμῶν nor Schultess's νόμων is a probable correction. θεῶν is a stop-gap put in after the right word had dropped out, because it ended with -ων; and the right word is τεθέντων (*cf.* τοῖς τεθείσι νόμοις, two lines above).

Ibid. 717 A. βέλη δὲ . . . τὰ ποῖ' ἂν λεγόμενα ὀρθότατα φέροιτ' ἂν. For the awkward λεγόμενα Schanz proposed φερόμενα, H. Richards γιγνόμενα. A better substitute would be τεινόμενα (*cf.* τείνειν βέλην, *Soph. Ph.* 198; τ. λόγον, *Phaedo* 63 A).

Ibid. 727 A. θείων γὰρ ἀγαθὸν πού τιμή, τῶν δὲ κακῶν οὐδὲν τίμιον. The customary construe of this makes no relevant sense, and none of the emendations proposed gets to the root of the difficulty. By reading θείων, and by construing τιμή as 'honorific oblation' and τίμιον as 'honorific,' we can at least make some pertinent sense of the clause.

Ibid. 890 A. For ἅπαντα read ἀγαπητά, 'the favourite talk'; this by haplography became ἀπητα, which is very

close to ἀπαντα. For similar instances *cf.* 687 C, 893 B, 928 B.

Ibid. 949 D. πάντων τῶν τοιούτων τὴν πρώτην ἀνάγκην ἱατὴν εἶναι τῆς ζημίας. The context shows that no mention of 'remedy' can be tolerated here. Hence such emendations as Stallbaum's ἱατικὴν or Ast's ἴασιν are insufferable. It has also escaped the notice of the critics that there lurks a corruption in τῆς ζημίας as well as in ἱατὴν. Both may be cured at one stroke by reading τάττειν εἶναι τὰς ζημίας. For this phrase *cf.* 876 C; and for the corruption *cf.* -τάττην for τάττειν 766 A, and 836 B (also Bast p. 740).

Ibid. 960 D. τὸ Λάχεσιν μὲν τὴν πρώτην εἶναι . . . δύναμιν. In spite of Jowett's heroic attempt to construe this as it stands, most readers will agree with Stallbaum that it is 'locus foede corruptus.' Of the many attempts at restoration some assume verbal corruption only (of λεχθέντων and τῷ πυρί), others interpolation plus corruption. Thus Stallbaum brackets all from ἀπεικασμένα to πυρί besides correcting to νηθέντων and πολύπη and ἀπεργαζομένην. D. Peipers (in his 'Quaestiones Criticae de Plat. Legg.', 1863) also suspects adscripts and ingeniously emends τῷ πυρί to τῇ σφύρα (*cf.* *Hor. C. I.* 35.17; *III.* 24. 5), reading τὴν Ἀτροπον δὲ τρίτην, σώτειραν τῇ σφύρα τὴν ἀμ. ἀπεργαζομένην δύναμιν. But none of these solutions is wholly satisfactory. It is a mistake to separate τρίτην from σώτειραν. The simplest device is to read ληχθέντων for λεχθέντων (with Bekker), to eject the next four words as a gloss, and to write κύρει in place of πυρί: of which the result is—τὴν Ἀ. δὲ τρίτην σώτειραν, τῶν ληχθέντων τῷ κύρει τὴν ἀμ. ἀπεργαζομένων (or -ην) δύναμιν. This is confirmed by the language of the parallel passage, *Rep.* 620 E (κυροῦντα ἢν λαχὼν εἴλετο μοῖραν).

Ibid. 965 E. εἰ δ' ἄρα τὸ παράπαν δοκεῖ ἔάν, ὅραν δὲ χρεῶν. So Burnet. But the MSS. give not ὅραν δὲ but ρηι, δρηι, ορηι. The most obvious correction is here, surely, the best, viz. ὅπη (*sc.* ποιητέον, or the like).

R. G. BURY.

TERENTIANA.

tu quoque tu in summis, o dimidiate Menander, poneris, et merito, puri sermonis amator. lenibus atque utinam scriptis adiuncta foret vis, comica ut aequato virtus polleret honore cum Graecis, neve hac despectus parte iaceres! unum hoc maceror ac doleo tibi deesse, Terenti.

—C. Julius Caesar *apud* Sueton. *de Poetis*.

In Landor's *Imaginary Conversations* (Vol. II. of C. G. Crump's edition, p. 118), in the second conversation between Asinius Pollio and Licinius Calvus, the latter says: 'Yes, I remember his (*i.e.* Caesar's) opinion conveyed in verse, and principally for its too strong expression, *unum hoc maceror: doleo* is weak after this, and *doleo* is itself almost an exaggeration.'

We may let Landor's estimate of the strength of *doleo* pass; but he was surely right in perceiving an anticlimax from *maceror* to *doleo*. Mr. Garrod emends the line tacitly in his *Oxford Book of Latin Verse* to read—

unum hoc maceror aureolo tibi deesse, Terenti.

The pretty diminutive does not commend itself to me as probable in the author and the context. I suggest that Caesar wrote—

unum hoc maceror, haud aliud, tibi deesse Terenti.

One thing, and one thing alone, is lacking—that is what is so tragical and so tormenting about Terence. If only he had *vis* (not *vis comica*, a modern figment) he would be perfect.

Terence, *Heautontimorumenos*, Prologue, 28-35:

facite aequi sitis: date crescendi copiam
novarum qui spectandi faciunt copiam
sine vitiiis. Ne ille pro se dictum existimet

32. qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via
decesse populum: quor insano serviat?
eius de peccatis plura dicet cum dabit
alias novas etc.

I have long had the conviction that l. 33 of this is nonsense, such nonsense as the loss of Donatus makes possible only in this play. The commentators apparently agree in taking Terence to mean that Luscius Lanuvinus has committed an absurdity in representing the public in the street as giving way before

a slave in a hurry, and to add the comment that this is tantamount to making the public a slave to a madman. This view is indicated already in the *Commentarius Antiquior* published in F. Schlee's *Scholia Terentiana* (Teubner, 1893).

If Terence could find no worse fault in the works of the old poet than that, he must have been hard up for a stone to throw. A man who can believe in cold blood that Terence meant by the words *quor insano serviat?* to express 'Why should it (the public) make itself the slave of a madman?' will believe anything! Why on earth should the stock character of *servus currens* (Plaut. *Merc.* 109, Ter. *Heaut.* Prol. 37, etc.), be described as *insanus* because the people make way for him? And why should making way for him be called a servitude? And how is anybody to divine who is the subject of the verb *serviat?*

We may get some guidance from Terence's other encounters with *vetus poeta*.

In the other two prologues, in which he not merely defends himself (*e.g.* on the charge of *contaminatio*, in Prol. *Andr.*) but carries the war into the enemy's country, those of *Eunuchus* and *Phormio*, he attacks certain absurdities in point of usage or taste: as, making a respondent speak before a petitioner, or the pitiful scene of the daft youth and the hunted hind. And this suits well with a statement in Suetonius' *Life of Terence*, that one reason assigned for his voyage to Greece was 'percipiendi Graecorum instituta moresque, quos non perinde exprimeret in scriptis.' To be familiar with Greek social conditions and institutions was reputed a great point of craftsmanship. I suggest that the absurdity here charged against Luscius consisted in this: in his play a slave, running along the street, announces that the term of his servitude has been officially decided. Suppose such a scene as *Adelphi*, Act III. sc. ii., in which the analogue of Terence's Geta should inform the audience of this

piece of news. This would be expressed in the reading.

qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via
decesse populum *quot is in annos serviat.*

Luscius' absurdity may be held to consist partly in the choice of incongruous conditions, but especially in implying that servitude limited to a term of years foreordained was usual at Athens. The only mention of a precise term of years of slavery that I have discovered yet is in Cic. *Phil.* VIII. 11. 32, 'cum in spem libertatis sexennio post sumus ingressi diutiusque servitutem perperissi quam captivi frugi et diligentes solent.'

Wallon's *Histoire de l'Esclavage* seems not to recognise such a case. Perhaps some reader of the *Classical Review* can help with an instance.

Heaut. 958 (V. ii. 6.) Menedemus says :

scio tibi esse hoc gravius multo ac durius
quod fit; verum ego haud minus aegre patior.

'I know it is much harder and crueller for you, to whom the thing happens in fact, but I am just as dreadfully sorry about it as you.'

So far good : but here the MSS. go off into nonsense.

id qui nescio
nec rationem capio, nisi quod tibi bene ex
animo volo.

Mr. Gray (in his ed. of 1895, Cambridge) translates this as follows : 'I who don't understand it and cannot comprehend the meaning of it, only from my heart I wish you well.' To which one may object that *nescio* is not the Latin for 'I do not understand,' nor *nec rationem capio* for 'I cannot comprehend the meaning.' But the drift of the sentence is plain, and there is very little amiss with the reading. Make it—

verum ego haud minus aegre patior. *Qui id fit?*
Nescio,
nec rationem capio etc.

'I feel it as much as you do. How that can be? I don't know, and I can't account for it, unless it is the force of sympathy, because I am so fond of you.'

Tibi bene volo is stronger than our 'I wish you well': it is the Italian *ti voglio bene*.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University, Glasgow.

MERGERE AND PRIAP. 65.

Hic tibi qui rostro crescentia lilia mersit
caeditur e tepida uictima porcus hara.
ne tamen exanimum facias pecus omne, Priape,
horti sit facias ianua clausa tui.

THE first volume of Buecheler's collected opuscula has just been published, and it includes the celebrated 'uindiciae libri Priapeorum' from *Rhein. Mus.* xviii pp. 381-415, written at the age of twenty-six, but inferior to none of its author's work in his special characteristic of patient ingenuity. The note upon the first verse of this poem runs as follows (*Rh. M.* p. 405, *kl. Schr.* I p. 352, where there are two misprints):

'oscitantia incredibili propagabatur qui rostro lilia mersit, Heinsius tamen *carpsit* uel *rasit* uel *rosit* proposuerat. nimirum Ovidius *rode caper uitem* dixit, Martialis *uite nocens rosa hircus*. at *rostro rodere* dedecet poetam. hic ut ego emendaui sic Ovidius *uite caper morsa*,

Iuuenalis *haedulus inscius herbae necdum ausus uirgas humilis mordere salicti*, Vergilius *signata admorso in stirpe cicatrix*.'

His emendation, as he calls it, was *morsit*. This he had printed already in his smaller Petronius of 1862, he repeated it in 1871 and 1882 and 1904, and it is piously preserved by Mr Heraeus in the 5th edition. Yet all that Buecheler has to say for it is said above: there is no defence of the form; no sign of any suspicion that defence is needed; not even a reference to Gellius vi 9 7. And then it is others who are charged with 'oscitantia incredibilis.' It is incredibilis oscitantia to believe for forty years and more that in the age of Ovid (for that is the age to which Buecheler assigned the Priapea) they said *morsit* for *momordit*.

The verb *mordere* is not even suitable. Goats, it is true, damage vegetation by nibbling it; but the devastation spread by M. Grunnius Corocotta, soliuertiator, when he and his snout get into the garden, consists much rather in routing up and in breaking down, and is much better described by *mersit*, which means *obruit*, *afflxit*, *perdidit*, *pessum dedit*. This use begins with cases where the metaphor is still clearly discernible and the disaster in which a thing is whelmed is expressed by the presence of an ablative: Verg. *Aen.* vi 429, xi 28 '*funere mersit acerbo*,' vi 512 '*me fata mea et scelus exitiale Lacaenae | his mersere malis*' (compare Liu. iii 16 4 '*superantibus aliis ac mergentibus malis*'), Liu. vi 17 2 '*mersam et obrutam fenore partem ciuitatis*,' Plin. *n.h.* vii 132 '*quam multos accepta adflixere imperia! quam multos bona perdidere et ultimis mersere suppliciis*!' Flor. i 47 (iii 12) 8 '*illae opes atque diuitiae adflixere saeculi mores, mersamque uitiis suis quasi sentina rem publicam pessum dedere*.' Then this ablative disappears and *mergere* by itself means *ruin*, *crush*; and if an ablative is present it expresses that *by which*, not *in which*, the thing is whelmed: Liu. ix 18 1 '*Alexandro nondum merso secundis rebus*,' Ouid. *trist.* iii 11 38 '*carnifici fortuna potest mea flenda uideri, | te tamen est uno iudice mersa parum*,' Vell. ii 91 3 '*cum esset omni flagitiorum scelerumque conscientia mersus, nec melior illi res familiaris quam mens foret*,' Sen. *ep.* 55 3 '*quotiens aliquos amicitiae Asinii Galli, quotiens Seiani odium, deinde amor merserat*,' Luc. i 159 '*publica belli | semina, quae populos semper mersere potentes*,' vi 8 '*placet alea fati | alterutrum mersura caput*,' vii 655 '*trahere*

omnia secum | mersa iuuat gentesque suae miscere ruinae,' viii 509 '*regesque timet, quorum omnia mersit*,' anth. Lat. Ries. 472 1 '*non satis est quod nos mergit furiosa iuuentus | transuersosque rapit fama sepulta probris*,' Sil. viii 287 '*cernebat Paulus . . . labi, mergente sinistro | consule, res pessumque dari*,' Iuu. x 57 '*quosdam praecipitat subiecta potentia magnae | inuidiae, mergit longa atque insignis honorum | pagina*' (compare Cic. *pro Sull.* 87 '*rei publicae praecipitanti subueni, patriam demersam extuli*'), xiii 8 '*ut mediocris | iacturae te mergat onus*,' Plin. *n.h.* ix 67 '*nullusque prope iam mortalis aestimatur pluris quam qui peritissime cenum domini mergit*,' Verg. *Aen.* vi 615 '*ne quare doceri . . . quae forma uiros fortunaue mersit*' is not easily intelligible but appears to contain another example. So *mersare* in Lucr. v 1008 '*tum penuria deinde cibi languentia leto | membra dedit, contra nunc rerum copia mersat*'; so *demergere* in Hor. *carm.* iii 16 13 '*concidit auguris | Argiui domus ob lucrum | demersa exitio*,' Sen. *Med.* 528 '*his adice Colchos, adice et Aeeten ducem, | Scythas Pelasgis iunge: demersos dabo*'; and so βαπτίζειν and καταποντίζειν in Greek, Lobeck *Soph. Ai.* pp. 357 sq.

It will be noticed that in these examples the metaphor signifies ruin of fortune or health or character: Priap. 65 1 is singular, so far as I know, in extending it to material destruction, such as laying a row of lilies flat. The French *abîmer* has acquired and often enjoys this meaning, as in Hugo *Les Misérables* v 13 '*j'ai eu tort d'abîmer le chapeau de ce monsieur*.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

SOME CODICES VOSSIANI AND THE METAMORPHOSIS OF OVID.

IN a Berlin Programm¹ on the text of Book xv., the testimony of Nicolaus Heinsius, that at xv. 804 'Aeneaden' is the reading of a 'Codex Vossianus' of the poem, was dismissed as 'falsch'

¹ *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovids* (Berlin, 1893).

by Dr. Hugo Magnus, who arrived somewhat hastily at this conclusion on ascertaining from Dr. de Vries that the three MSS. of the *Metamorphosis*, from the library of Vossius, now at Leyden,² read

² These three Vossiani are quite distinct from the three MSS. of the *Metamorphosis*—

'illa deum,' 'etheri . . .,' and 'etherea' respectively. Happily, however, the Bodleian possesses the very volume in which Heinsius entered, in his own handwriting, not only a collation but also a description of the Vossianus in question, evidence which both establishes the truth of his statement and enables us to identify beyond a doubt this 'Codex Vossianus' with a MS. now in the British Museum, viz. Harleianus 2732. The Bodleian *Ovid*, which we may call X, is an Aldine of 1533, and in the catalogue is described, provisionally, as 'No. 640 of Poetae in 8vo and Bibliotheca Heinsiana.' X contains collations by N. H. of many MSS., four of them Vossiani, viz. G, H, I, f.

From information which Dr. de Vries has very kindly sent me it would seem that G and I are both at Leyden in the Bibliotheek der Rijks-Universiteit, numbered Quarto 25 ('olim A. Turnebi') and Oct. 51 respectively. G is the MS. from which Heinsius adopted tingitur at iv. 21, and it appears to offer placentior (εὐφροστέρα, Plan. cf. i. 527) at v. 603. De Vries regards it as 'of little value.' The description in X runs thus: 'Codex Vossianus D annorum qui Turnebi fuit. primus liber manu recentiori scriptus fuit.' I is somewhat featureless (see the collation of Book xv. made by De Vries for Magnus, *op. cit.*); but it is not quite clear that I and Oct. 51 are one and the same MS., for De Vries speaks of all three Leyden Vossiani as 'complete,' whereas I, teste Heinsius, lacked the first book and part of the second.¹ "I = codex Vossianus eiusdem aetatis. incipit, lib. ii. fab. Calistus' (*sic*). Of the third Leyden MS. ('Quarto 61')—the MS. which has 'illa deum' at xv. 804 (see C. R. xxvii. 257 f.)—there is no collation in X. Either N. H. col-

lated the MS. into another volume or he had the reading from some other source, perhaps from Vossius himself, who duly noted it, with a few excerpts, in the margin of his *Ovid* which is now in the Bodleian. These three Leyden Vossiani are all assigned by De Vries to the thirteenth century. Heinsius, it may be noted, tended to overestimate the age of his MSS.; f is described thus: 'Fragmentum eiusdem' (sc. Vossii) 'pari aetate, quod incipit lib. i. fab. Ius et desinit initio lib. viii.' The fragment, which is not known at Leyden, deserves honourable mention as the only MS. which has (or had) vi. 200 in its right place, the place to which it was restored *e coniectura* by Gronovius. A selection from f's readings may be added here.

Book ii. 19 at clivo. 62 non regit hos. 87 repugnat herinis. 200 sensere. 412 comam cui. 422 ut fessam vidit ('lege ut fessam videt' N. H.). 437 quive Iovem. 471 hoc unum restabat. 518 Est aliquid cur quis Iunonem (*unde* 'Estre aliquid' etc. N. H.). 743 Pleionaeque genus ego sum. Book iii. 31 aquis ibi conditus. 187 abstitit (*ut coniecit* Ellis). 202 vox ulla fuit. 291 est *omisit*. 396 attenuant. 641 furor egit Opheltis (Opheltis *ex silentio*). 665 distringunt. Book iv. 150 dabit hoc in vulnere vires. 715 lucentia. Book v. 49 formam. 70 abigitque ('fortasse abditque' N. H.). 266 floribus undas. 267 studiisque. 365 digna deae certe. 349 tentatque. 555 mixtae. 619 Dictynna. Book vi. 199 von tamen, etc., 'post hunc versum f legit illum hoc modo "Latoniae turba quae quantum distat ab orba" optime nisi quod *quo* legendum' N. H. 203 tacita venerantur numina mente (*ex* Vergilio *Aen.* i. 502?). Book vii. 115 nec ignes (*ut videtur*). 116 anhelatus. 155 in ingentes oculos. 234 et iam nona dies. 498 ramumque forens. 616 isse sub ampl. Aeg. Asop. ignem. 636 et promittere idem. 680 telum iactabile. 777 excussae.

This brings us to H, a MS. of marked individuality, 'H = Codex Vossianus eiusdem aetatis. usque ad fabulam Leucothoes libro iv. mutilus erat nonnullis tamen manu adscriptis recentiori. adscriptis denuo. est hiatus lib. vi.

viz., 'BPL. 95-96' (saec. xiii) and 'BPL.'s 97' (saec. xiv)—in the general collection of the Leyden University Library (=the 'tres Leidenses' cited from time to time by Heinsius and Burmann), for description of which see Codices MSS. Lugduni Batavorum (E. J. Brill, 1912).

¹ 'Further, I had at vii. 155 "sibi" for "ubi" ("ut coniecit" Merkel), a reading which, De Vries reports, is not to be found in either of the Leyden Vossiani.'

initio fab. Prognos usque lib. viii. oratione Althaeae.¹

This is the Vossianus from which N. H. records 'Aeneaden conatur' at xv. 804.

Turning to Harleianus 2742 (saec. xiii.), you notice at once that the first six folia are in a much later hand than the rest, and on examination find that they contain only portions of the earlier books; *i.e.* 'usque ad fabulan Leucothoes libro iv. mutilus est.' The original hand begins on the recto of fol. 7 at iv. 207. Passing on, you find at fols. 13 and 14 great holes in the vellum which have destroyed two inches by two inches of the text, and after fol. 20 a gap: for 20v ends with vi. 416—*i.e.* 'initio fab. Prognos'—and 21r opens with viii. 507—*i.e.* 'oratione Althaeae.' 'Two quaternions are lost. 'There are many "glosses" in the margins, and on fol. 1r the name of a former owner, "Alexander Betavius, senator Parisiensis," with the date 1645.' Wanley had the volume rebound.

The quality of the MS. may be gauged by the excerpts from its text of Book xv. published by Professor Housman in the *Journal of Philology*, xxii. 154ff., and used, with somewhat contradictory acknowledgments, by Magnus in his recent edition of the poem (see pp. xxiii and 3). The agreement between the text of H and the text of e (Mr. Housman's symbol for Harl. 2742)—viewed in connexion with the evidence of the lacunae—is too complete to admit any doubt as to their identity. Unfortunately the MS. does not appear to be of exceptional value.² But, like so many of the 'deteriores,' it has its good things, *e.g.* 'momenta (*suprascript* ni)' at xi. 285. In the same book 'Instabilesque arcus' (line 177) may demand consideration—unless 'arcus' has arisen from 'aurs,' *i.e.* 'aures.' At v. 590, for

the meaningless '(g)natas' of the Vulgate it has the '*varia lectio* gratas (*ut coniecit* Hellmuth),' adopting which we might do well to transpose lines 590 and 591 and to read the passage thus: 'Invenio sine vertice aquas, sine murmure euntes | . . . quas tu vix ire putares | sponte sua; gratas ripis declivibus umbras | cana salicta dabant nvtritaque populus unda.' In any case 'gratas' is right beyond a peradventure. And the confusion between 'gnatas' and 'gratas' here helps us to emend with something like certainty at xiii. 602, 'veluti cum flumina gratas | exhalant nebulas, nec sol admittitur infra.' 'Gratas,' a mere *epitheton ornans*, became first '*per errorem* gnatas' and then '*metri gratia* natas.' The archaic form 'gnatus' is frequent in the MSS. of the poem.

But the chief interest of the MS. lies in its reading 'Aeneaden,' at xv. 804, which, so far as we know, is unique; 'Aeneadem (*i.e.* en eadem!)' is a very different matter. On this line there is so much divergence in the MSS. that we can hardly hope to recover the truth. Since discussing the passage before in this *Review* I have seen a remarkable variant in a MS. in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Codex Strozianus 120 (the *alter Strozza* of Heinsius),³ written, so Signor Rostagno considers, in Upper Italy towards the end of saec. xii.—'Tum citharea suum palma percussit utraque | pectus et etherea—nube.' Haec in textu; in margine "at pectus et hanc nube molitur condere cede<m>." As to 'palma,' ἐπέχω—noting, however, with Mr. Garrod that the best MSS. almost without exception have 'suum'—not 'manu': 'manu in F' is from the second hand: but the variants 'sed tandem (h), aeth<erea se in rasura man. altera> de<m> sic F, <a>eneadem codd. non-mul.' look very like corruptions of a text containing either 'eadem' or 'eandem,' which in the Strozian variant has first changed places with 'nube' and then been assimilated to 'caedem' in 802.

¹ To M. Craster, of the Bodleian Library, I owe some assistance in deciphering this description and the suggestion that the second 'adscriptis' is a dittography. N. H. hesitated between two phrases ('manu adscr. rec.' and 'adscr. denuo'), and failing to decide which fitted the facts more aptly left them both standing.

² Magnus follows it against the rest at xv. 570 as well as at 804.

³ See footnote. The *prior Strozza* (saec. xii. *ineuntis*) of Heinsius is also in the Laurentian Library. Among other notable readings it has 'delo creteque' at xv. 541 and 'accenseor' at xv. 546.

This use of 'idem' is Ovidian (cf. iv. 593 and v. 205), and the indications point to 'hunc eadem molitur condere nube' or 'en eandem—nubem' as possibilities worth weighing."¹

But to resume: e came into Lord Harley's collection on October 22, 1725,² i.e. it was one of the large number of MSS. purchased for him on that day by Wanley from John James Zamboni, and should therefore be added to the list contained in Professor A. C. Clark's account of the transaction in the *Classical Review* for October, 1891, vol. v. p. 365 ff.³ But—"que diable venait-il faire dans cette galère?" The simplest explanation is that Voss had lent the MS. to Graevius, and that on his death in 1689 it remained in the Bibliotheca Graeviana. In earlier days, when Heinsius was editing the *Metamorphosis*, Graevius owned apparently only one MS. of the poem.⁴

In his sale catalogue⁵ he is credited with two, viz. 'No. 28, Ovidii Metamorphosis in pergamento' (= S the Codex Graevii proper); and 'No. 22, Ovid. Met. cum glossis in pergamento' (? = the borrowed Vossianus, now Harleianus 2742). He had also a Fragment (No. 54, Fragmenta Ciceronis de officiis . . . Ovidii Metamorph. et Euclidis Geometrica'), and in Harleianus 2610 the British Museum possesses a very notable Fragment (= i.-iii. 1-622. saec. X. exentis),⁶ which came into Lord Harley's

collection on that same 20th October, 1725, and which Professor Clark therefore traces to the Library of Graevius. If he is right, the fragment clearly formed part of this volume (viz. G 54), which we must assume to have been broken up by Wanley, who then had the Ovid rebound with two other classical fragments and the Euclidis *Geometrica* incorporated with some *Arithmetica* to form what is now Harleianus 3595.⁷ The 'fragmentum Ciceronis de officiis' is not accounted for as yet.)

But the question cannot be considered as finally settled. Voss, according to the hand-written catalogue of his MSS. (B. M., Egerton MS. 2260, fol. 150 vo.), had an 'Ovidii Metamorphosis vetustiss.', which has disappeared. Harl. 2610 is the oldest known MS. of any considerable portion of the poem.⁸

The Graevius catalogue does not mention the age of No. 54, and the Voss catalogue does not speak of the 'vetustiss.' as a fragment. But readers of Wanley's *Diary and Note-book*⁹ will remark that he had his eye on Voss's MSS., or some of them, as 'things proper for the Library in the hands of particular persons.'¹⁰

The problem is further complicated by the fact that the *fragmentum Vossianum* mentioned above has also disappeared—had disappeared, apparently, before Voss's death, since it is not mentioned in his catalogue. And Harleianus 2610 was unknown to Heinsius, who yet was in touch with both Graevius and Vossius, to the former of whom he owed knowledge of (and permission to

¹ For 'eadem' as a disyllable there is the authority of Virgil, but 'eandem' I do not remember to have met elsewhere except in Accius (apud Nonium s.v. 'vesci')⁴ . . . accumbat mensam aut eandem oescatur dapem.' Yet another possibility is 'oectus et hunc molitur eadem condere sube,' 'eadē' having fallen out before 'cōdere.'

² The date is entered on the first page in Wanley's hand, '20 die Octobris, 1725' (sic).

³ 'The Library of J. G. Graevius.'

⁴ This he lent to Heinsius, who named it S ('S = Codex Joh. Georgii Graevii, 400 annorum'), and has left us its readings registered under the siglum in X. It is the MS. from which he restored 'vi' for 'ut' at vi. 690/691 and 'ululatus' at vii. 190.

⁵ British Museum, Department of Printed Books, 126a 16.

⁶ 'Cod. Harleianus 2610 . . . scriptus est, ut opinatur E. M. Thompson, cui submissa est cura codicum qui in Museo Britannico servante, exeunte fere saeculo X., in Germania' (R. Ellis, *Anecd. Oxon.*, class. ser., vol. i., part v., p. v).

See also *Journal of Philology*, xii. 65 ff. The discovery and discussion of this MS. was Ellis' chief contribution to the study of the *Metamorphosis*.

⁷ Harl. 3595. Boethi Artis Arithmeticae libr. ii.—de Musica [G(raevianus) 8]—*Geometriae Euclidis libr. ii.* sic '[G. 54]' (Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 371).

⁸ a is certainly, λ and π possibly, ninth century; but they are mere fragments, and in other respects are out of the question.

⁹ Lansdowne MS. 677.

¹⁰ The entry under date May, 1722, has not escaped me, but it is too vague to be regarded as closing this avenue of enquiry. Harleianus 2610 is a Quarto, and Wanley had not then seen the MSS., but only a list of them, from which 'they seem to be,' etc.

collate) the two Erfurdt MSS. This he states in so many words in X.

The upshot of this inquiry is that we need more light on the *codices Vossiani* of the poem. What has become of the *fragmentum Vossianum*?¹

¹ I note for what it is worth the fact that Graevius, according to his catalogue, possessed in MS. the 'Observationes Gronovii in Metamorphosin Ovidii' (G. 92). Now the restoration of vi. 200 to its proper place in the text was one of Gronovius' most brilliant contributions to the criticism of the poem. If Graevius was interested in this particular problem, he may well have borrowed from Voss the fragment Vossianum (which alone among known

Why are there four MSS. of the *Metamorphosis* in the catalogue of V.'s Library and only three now at Leyden, which yet bought the collection entire? Last—this is the point of supreme interest—if Vossius really possessed, as the evidence would indicate, an 'Ovidii Metamorphosis vetustiss.', can the manuscript be traced? Was it or was it not Harleianus 2610?

D. A. SLATER.

MSS. supports the conjecture) in order to satisfy a very natural curiosity as to the general character of the codex which confirmed his friend the critic. But this is a long shot.

REVIEWS

CLIO ENTHRONED.

Clio Enthroned: a Study of Prose Form in Thucydides. By WALTER R. M. LAMB. Large 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. xv + 319. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914. 10s. net.

THIS is a good book, and important. Most critics praise the intellect of Thucydides, but content themselves with mild and puzzled disapproval of his style. Realising the probability that style reflects intellect, Mr. Lamb asks us to withhold our disapproval until we have tried to understand. He has analysed the stylistic methods, not only of Thucydides, but also of his contemporaries, and, so far as is possible, of his predecessors. The result throws light upon the history of Greek prose, reveals in Thucydides 'the ambition of producing not merely a truthful document but a vigorous and impressive witness of the truth,' and points a way towards a reasonable solution of the hitherto rather barren controversy as to the alleged interpolation of the text. Finally, the revelation of method and purpose in the style makes it easier to understand the intellectual greatness of the history.

At the outset Mr. Lamb thought it necessary to refute the plausibilities of Mythistoria. It may be doubted whether

Mr. Cornford himself still finds Thucydides ignorant of politics and blind to economics, misled by superstition, capable of sacrificing, deliberately or unconsciously, the truth of event to the exigencies of drama. If so, he will find food for reflection here. But I hope the refutation is unnecessary. I should willingly sacrifice this wholesome and entertaining demonstration that Thucydides is not what he is not, for a more complete discussion of his mind and purpose as they really are. Had Mr. Lamb substituted for his just exposure of Mythistoria a chapter on the arrangement of the subject-matter of the history, he would, I think, have been wise. By insisting upon the imaginative value of the so-called digressions concerning Pausanias and Themistocles (p. 17), and upon the fine political psychology which makes relevant the episode of Harmodios and Aristogeiton (p. 78), Mr. Lamb suggests a method by which he might have laid a broader foundation for his later argument. In the arrangement of his material, as in style, Thucydides used art, not always perfect, but always intelligent and deliberate; and the art is the servant of intellect, displaying, not distorting or concealing, truth. Consider, for example, Book III., broken up,

according to Dionysius, with whom Mr. Lamb very nearly agrees, 'into mere small change.' Mr. Lamb might have pointed out, if he had not been hurrying to the conflict with Mythistoria, that, at any rate, chapters 1-88 have an artistic arrangement which is also historically significant. Dionysius complains that the treatment is disjointed; that no episode is completed before another is begun. He does not realise the purpose. Of course the framework is provided by the division of summer and winter. But there is more art than Dionysius sees. In the *Iliad*, when Achilles has withdrawn to his tent, you are allowed for a time to forget him. Then, when you suddenly hear that he is still angry, still withdrawn, you realise the length of his absence, how much he is missed by the fighters, how much he must long for the fight. That kind of effect is produced by the splitting up of the agony of Plataea and Mytilene, and the sudden reminder of Potidaea. Moreover, the artist has contrived, as if by the accidental connivance of his annalistic method, to present together on his moral canvas three significant scenes; the end of Mytilene (the crime so narrowly escaped by Athens), the end of Plataea (the crime of the Peloponnesians), and finally, the distraction of Corcyra (the criminal effect of war among oligarchs and democrats alike). Similarly, an analysis of Book I. would show how the historian uses his methodical scheme to throw into clear relief the fundamental principles which his narrative tends to illustrate and prove. When he is ostensibly demonstrating no more than the comparative magnitude of the war—in the traditional manner of the story-teller magnifying his theme—he is actually informing us of the original causes of war, and teaching us the importance, first, of sea-power, then of that economic struggle to which superficial critics have thought him blind.

With Mr. Lamb's notion of the part played by the speeches I entirely agree. 'So careful of the proportions of his whole picture' is Thucydides, 'that he leaves the methodical path of verified record, and boldly shows, in suggestive abstract, how he conceives the situation to have "reasoned out" itself.' I agree

also that it was the vogue of such political discussion which gave Thucydides the opportunity for this new employment of 'the venerable form of epic speech.' Much of the language which seemed to Mr. Cornford to show that Thucydides was obsessed by superstition is probably the reflection of the actual current use of such language as rhetorical commonplace. Most illuminating, for example, is the remark that 'the most natural explanation' of the verbiage in the Melian dialogue is, firstly, that there was a great deal of empty verbiage going on at Athens; secondly, that all Greece was aware that 'for this grim business it had been employed to dress up the nakedness of a foregone conclusion.' But I think that Mr. Lamb would have made his argument stronger if he had included in his preliminary discussion an investigation of the part played by these commonplaces in the earlier moralising poetry. He rightly denies (pp. 26-28) that Thucydides was insensible to poetry. In regard to details he occasionally mentions Pindaric themes, to which the intellectual method has given new form and significance. But more than this is needed. In general, in the speeches, the reasoned comment, Thucydides uses, in his own way, and for his own purpose, a body of proverbial morality which is used, in other ways and for other purposes, not only by sophists and orators, but also by tragic and lyrical poets. Just as Pindar is unintelligible to those who do not realise how familiar is the raw material, so the peculiar use made of the same material by Thucydides can only be estimated in its intellectual greatness by those who are aware that the material is commonplace. Just as for the narrative of the deed we trace the story-telling tradition from Homer to Herodotus and Thucydides, so for the abstract reasoning of the word we take cognisance of the series Hesiod, Solon, Theognis, Pindar, Simonides, and so on. When we are told, for instance, that we have misjudged Thucydides, from ignoring the 'freshness and strength' of his doctrine that reasonable precaution is a safer guide than confidence in luck, we look for a discussion of the doctrine of *Sophrosyne* (The Modest Mean, Cautious

Discretion, Deluded Self-Confidence) in its earlier, less intellectualised applications. The profound analysis (III. 82, 2) of the moral effects of civil war, which corrupts good men because in civil war they have no choice but a choice of crimes, is characteristic of Thucydides: but the expressions used are to us difficult because most of us have never understood the doctrine delivered by Simonides to Scopas. Such an investigation as I suggest would have its value also, for Mr. Lamb's particular purpose, the appreciation of the style. In his chapter on Personification, though he is led away by the mirage of 'origins,' and is perhaps rather fantastic in his conception of Aeschylus, Mr. Lamb has clearly shown that it was for artistic purposes, not because of supernatural obsessions, that Thucydides 'energised with a personal activity almost any concept that might claim the chief interest of the moment.' But the reader would, I think, have been helped by a quieter and simpler preliminary statement. Mr. Lamb himself might have been helped by the effort of making it. The liberties which Thucydides takes with language, the shifts of construction, and something too of the 'clashing and drumming' of which we hear so much, are made possible, partly by the familiarity of the raw material, partly by the fact that an audience inured to the discipline of choral lyric is already able to cope with such liberties and shifts. Moreover, when Mr. Lamb proceeds, as I hope he will, to build a larger edifice on the foundations he has laid, he will find it necessary (having already established the use of heroic cadences, the growing preference for iambic and trochaic, and, in general, the attentiveness of Thucydides to rhythm), to take into account the larger schemes of Pindar, the nearest approach which the regularity of verse has made to the ostensibly unstudied irregularity of prose. Much that Mr. Lamb calls 'heroic,' or 'iambic,' or 'trochaic,' can best be appreciated if we recall the rhythms of the Pindaric dactylo-epitrite.

For the main work, the study of the style, 'a new instrument wielded by an original mind,' 'new modes of thought met and developed by the practice of a

growing skill,' I have nothing but praise. The two most characteristic methods are vividly presented to us by a contrast between I. 137, 2, 'straightforward story-telling,' marked, however, by a 'definite attempt to arrange the "running" style in some kind of order corresponding to the thought,' and III. 82, where the words are elaborately 'drilled' in a 'sudden endeavour to make the hearer realise, under a steady process of clashing and drumming—antithesis, pariosis, paromoiosis—the unique mental scene.' We are then shown, by instances from historical fragments, the advance of early logography from the 'patchwork of little clauses' towards 'largeness and freedom.' The 'facile' style of Herodotus is less helpful for the understanding of the normal narrative-style of Thucydides than the work of Hippocrates and his circle, very important material, whose importance for this purpose Mr. Lamb seems to be the first critic to discover. But 'the text-book manner' of Thucydides, with its 'freedom and precision,' its condensation, due 'to a desire, not simply of brevity, but of stamping a strange phrase on the memory,' its creation of 'a framework, holding in a compact yet regular order' all the relevant ideas, is Thucydidean, not Hippocratean. Both experimenters have predecessors in this kind of work, the authors of an early didactic prose, Heracleitus especially, and others of whose work we possess only fragments.

The 'stately method' of Protagoras, convincingly reconstructed from Platonic imitations and from some of the Hippocratean treatises, introduces more directly rhetorical influence; and the third stage is the vogue of the 'gallantries of Gorgias,' which can 'split a thought into two halves, polish each half with a distinctive word, and tie them up again with a jingle.' Thucydides employs all these methods, and though sometimes his experiments fail, his achievement in all is great. 'While he could see much folly and harm in the excessive vogue of Protagorean disputation, he could make use of its formal precision for the conduct, in particular, of his terse reflective style.' So again 'he saw that Gorgias and his school were working . . . towards an adaptation

of the charm of poetry to the service of truth and right. . . . The Euphuist could only pluck a few of the magic plumes, and strut in ludicrous glory. But Thucydides was able, and boldly chose, to summon the powers of poetry to support and recommend the grave discourse of reason.'

The importance of Mr. Lamb's analysis for the problem of interpolation is evident. I hope I have suggested also how important it is for the understanding of Greek prose in general, of the mind of Thucydides, and of the relation

of art to science in historical writing. He will have fulfilled the very high expectations which his book has aroused, when he has given us also, as he is qualified to give, a complete and satisfactory translation of Thucydides; a larger study of his mind and art, as revealed, not only in his style and rhythm, but also in his arrangement of subject-matter and in his treatment of ideas; and a general history of the development of Greek prose.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

HOMER: DICHTUNG UND SAGE.

Homer: Dichtung und Sage. Erster Band. *Ilias.* By ERIC BETHE. 8 $\frac{1}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{8}$ ". Pp. x + 374. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914. M. 8.

THIS is a work which will cause both satisfaction and disappointment, ἄμα χάρις καὶ ἄλγος, to the Unitarian and the Dissector of Homer alike. For Dr. Bethe's thesis in this first volume is this, that the *Iliad* is an artistic unity, designed and executed by one individual. But then he affirms that it is not the creation of a genius, but the toilsome production of a man of intelligence—no mere *Stümper*—who has, with artistic tact and considerable aptitude for composition—he was *kein Kleber und Flicker*—welded together into one grand and beautifully arranged whole a mass of poems, differing in origin, extent, and purpose, by lopping, altering, and adding to them. In a second volume, which is to deal with the Cyclics and the *Odyssey*, grounds are to be given for the belief that this 'author of our *Iliad*' was an Athenian of the sixth century. An explanation will also be expected of the fact that this Athenian died to contemporaries and posterity, as soon as he had given to his people an epic which they took to their hearts at once and cherished as a supreme national treasure. This is unquestionably a serious difficulty, and it is one which Finsler and others who believe in much the same *floruit* have not sought to mitigate. It will be futile to lead us up carefully, as

Dr. Bethe does in Book I. (*Vorfragen*), from the day of the primeval *Lied* to the period of *Buchepän*, if we are to be left there in helpless contemplation of this blank impossibility.

Book II. opens with a chapter which states the case for unity, based on the purpose, arrangement, and articulation, the balance, symmetry, and parallelism, and the art of controlling and combining material, which are apparent throughout the epic. The subject also is one. The Wrath of Achilles and its consequences penetrate the whole poem, which cannot be reduced to an Achilleid. The books usually proscribed are not merely in place; they are essential, and their removal would destroy the equilibrium. The poem is a true *Iliad*, in the construction of which design is to be traced from the first book to the last.

But it would be rash to conclude from this that the *Iliad* is in all parts the original work of one poet. That is a present tendency of Homeric study, but it is, Dr. Bethe thinks, only a hasty assumption, and a result of the reaction against the old 'blind mania for dismembering and mangling.' Only analysis can show to what the unity of the poem is due. If that discloses irreconcilable contradictions in detail, then Dr. Bethe sees no other possible explanation than this, that the author of the *Iliad*, while working with firm hand according to a great plan, at the same time made use of older poems.

There was a time when the explana-

tion was that Small Lays had been strung together, and not always by a firm hand, but Dr. Bethe finds his own view confirmed by a dissection of the poem. He is precisely 'the analytic reader in hot search of discrepancies' that Andrew Lang fought. His starting-point is the 'Great Discrepancy,' as it has been called, between the character of Achilles in the 9th *Iliad* and that presented in the 11th and 16th. But, except for very forcible, and very able, reiteration of the depth and impassability of the psychological chasm, there is nothing new, unless it be the quotation of a bit of *Il. i. 231*, οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις, with the most questionable assertion that this refers to the chiefs and not to the host. The first word of the part not quoted, δημοβόρος, might have given Dr. Bethe pause. But no discussion of the matter can possibly be complete that neglects Andrew Lang's great vindication.¹ That is not a demonstration which can be taken as indicating what Dr. Bethe, with remarkable coolness, imputes to his adversaries on this point, 'the courage of despair.' Nor is he more satisfying on another great Iliadic crux, the Wall. We cannot allow that, when the Wall is not expressly mentioned, the particular poet concerned did not know it had played a part in the *Troica*, or that, when it is mentioned and the mention is inconvenient, the reference may be pooh-poohed or explained as an *Einschaltung*.

These are two samples of the big things, matters of old, old controversy, regarding which Dr. Bethe has to convert a large public. A third point that may be cited is Dr. Bethe's very own. He reproduces his well-known essay entitled *Hektors Abschied*, and would have us believe there was a separate epic poem on that subject. But the hypothesis was severely criticised when it first appeared, and its presentation in this volume in no way strengthens it.

And of course, in addition to such questions of cardinal interest, there are many others of minor importance, but all affording plenty of scope for differ-

ence of opinion, so that Dr. Bethe is in incessant conflict with other analysers. But what after all will provoke objection more surely is the evidence offered us of the adaptation of a number of epics, of which nothing was known till modern critics invented them and gave them names. Dr. Bethe recovers these, or their truncated and doctored remains, indicates the *callidae juncturae*, and demarcates the composer's own *Verbindungsstücke*, for the most part with easy confidence. But the general method is that of the old and discredited Higher Criticism, with greatly increased scope for personal appreciation in regard to the quality of the poetry, differences of style, the peculiar ways of poets and composer, and above all the motives which swayed the latter in the disposal of his materials. It is this subjective element, betrayed by many an *unmöglich, selbstverständlich* or *vermuthlich*, that weakens the proof and hinders conviction. And altogether one cannot resist the old feeling, that it has almost become a principle of this style of disintegrating criticism that any evidence will do to establish a Homeric proposition.

The volume concludes with a delimitation of the Lay of the Wrath, in a section which evinces no sympathy with the new notion that this lay came last of all, and was the *motif* used to bind a number of others into an *Iliad*. On the contrary, it was an ancient poem, of some 1,500 verses, which had already suffered from the attentions of bards before the author of an *Iliad* made it the framework of his great epic. The remarks in this section on the characteristics and contents of the old poem, such as the similes, the divine machinery, the female element and the 'hero-list,' seem to be particularly open to adverse criticism.

A third volume, it appears, is to deal with the Saga, and will be specially welcome, for we shall doubtless find in it a mature and comprehensive statement of the Saga-displacement cult, of which Dr. Bethe is the acknowledged hierophant, and which has an interesting history. But it has languished of recent years and needs revivification. And there should be, by all means, a fourth volume to deal with the language.

¹ Mr. Smyth's excellent addition to it had no doubt not been published when Dr. Bethe wrote.

The final dissection of either epic will be that one which stands the linguistic test, and this latest distribution of authorship seems to provide a rare opportunity for confirmation *a posteriori* by means of the language.

A priori one cannot say that the origin propounded seems a likely one for a poem so glorious in form and structure as the *Iliad* is to Dr. Bethe, and the difficulty which one feels is well illustrated by a metaphor which he himself employs. 'The builder of the *Iliad*,' he says, 'did not build with stone fresh from the quarry, but converted smaller buildings already existing into a mighty castle (*zu einem gewaltigen Schlosse umgebaut*), according to a great uniform plan.' But surely in such a case men knock the old structures to bits and use the materials. If they built them in bodily with alterations, the result would be a quaint and a sorry conglomerate, and that is just the kind of performance which we should expect from Dr. Bethe's *Verfasser*. In this metaphor we see for the moment what Dr. Mackail has called 'the deep-seated confusion between two things, a poem and a story or stories—many already the subject of skilled poetical treatment—on which the poem was founded,' the old conflict, in fact, between Epos and Saga, *compositio* and *materies*.

The volume will probably be found to be too German for foreign taste. It is thoroughly German in method, of course, and in loyalty to the Wolf-begotten idea that there is something wrong with the *Iliad*. It is German also in its exclusiveness. There is not, I think, a single reference in the Analysis to any French or Italian authority, and those to British, American, and Dutch treatises are extremely few, and nearly all of them extremely brief. I have not met the names of Monro, Lang, Allen, or Stawell. One cannot admit that German criticism of Homer is so pre-eminent *über Alles* as this would imply.

It has had many a hard word said of it in recent times, and not the least bitter were from those of its own household.

One thing we are forbidden to say of such criticism, that its results differ extraordinarily. Yet one cannot help saying thus much. It has given us theories of Small Lays, of Kernels and Expansions, of Achilleids and extended Achilleids, of a Lay of the Wrath that was a kernel, and a Lay of the Wrath that was the shell in which was gathered the 'poetry about Troy,' and of an *Iliad* that was a Traditional Book, that may have been recited in the tenth century, and went on growing for centuries, that is, during a period when, according to Dr. Bethe and Dr. Mülher, there was no *Iliad* at all, the former's *Verfasser* and the latter's genuine *Dichter* not having arisen. Of course any one of these explanations of an admittedly great work of art may prove to be the right one. But what is certainly strange is that they should all be the outcome of contemplation of the same old stock *Unebenheiten*, the very existence of which is strenuously denied by other high authorities, who adhere to Dr. Jevons' opinion that a poetical, as distinguished from a logical, inconsistency has yet to be found. If we cannot say *tempus desistere pugnæ*, we may at least be permitted to hope that the Last of the Hypotheses has now been propounded, and that those interested may brace themselves to the task of selecting one or rejecting all.

The Index is meagre. The excellent example set by Rothe and Drerup in this respect might be borne in mind when the work is complete. The following misprints may be noted. For 'A 331,' p. 75 *n.*, read 'A 231'; for 'A und T,' p. 182, 'I und T'; for 'meeting,' p. 281 *n.*, 'mutiny'; for 'Guilb.,' p. 360 *n.*, 'Gilb.'; and for 'G. Roethe,' p. 369 *n.*, 'C. Rothe' (cf. p. 353 *n.*).

A. SHEWAN.

OVID, *HEROIDES* AND *AMORES*.

Ovid, Heroides and Amores. With an English translation by GRANT SHOWERMAN, Professor of Latin in the University of Wisconsin. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. 524. Heinemann, 1914. 5s. net.

THOUGH this new literal translation of the *Heroides* and *Amores* does not attain to any special grace of style, it is less bald than Riley's by no means contemptible version in Bohn's series. To represent Ovid, a prince of stylists, adequately in a language not his own is an almost impossible task. To those who have forgotten their Ovid, or are making his acquaintance for the first time, the new version will be helpful; but it must be used with caution, for it is by no means perfect. Words are sometimes omitted; thus *H. vi. 66 ventus concava vela tenet* is rendered 'the wind bellies out the sail,' which ignores the word *tenet* and mistranslates *vela* as singular. *H. x. 15 adductis somnerunt pectora palmis* is rendered 'my palms resounded upon my breasts,' which ignores *adductis*. Sometimes the reading translated is not that of the text, as *ii. 122 quaeque patent oculis litora lata meis*. Here the translation 'where'er the sea-view opens broad before my eyes' is a rendering of the reading *quaque patent oculis aequora lata meis*. *Am. I. xii. 19 illa dedit turpes ravis bubonibus umbras* is the reading of the text; but the translation 'it gave its foul shade to hoarse horned owls' renders the reading *raucis*. Sometimes tenses are incorrectly represented: thus *H. vi. 18 obsequium, maneo si tua, grande tuli* is rendered 'I shall think myself treated with all indulgence, so I remain yours.' But *tuli* is perfect. The meaning is 'If I remain your wife, I have won your high devotion.' *Am. I. xii. 26* the imperfect *fletet* translated 'weeps' should be 'wept.'

The translator's scholarship is at times faulty: a more careful study of Palmer and Shuckburgh's editions of the *Heroides* and Némethy's of the *Amores* would have removed many shortcomings. I ignore Brandt's ambitious com-

mentary on the *Amores* which provokes disgust on account of the author's lewdness, which leaves no depths of obscenity ancient or modern unexplored. I give a few examples of faulty scholarship. *H. i. 1 hanc tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixee*. Here *lento* is translated 'slow of return,' which it does not mean. What it does mean is 'cold-hearted,' 'indifferent,' as in *i. 66 ubi lentus abes?* where Showerman's translation 'where do you idly tarry,' is also wrong. So also in *ii. 23* and *viii. 18*, in both which places the translation is incorrect. *H. ii. 17 scelerate* is mistranslated 'wretched man.' It means 'you criminal' or 'wicked man,' and is rightly translated 'wicked' in *H. x. 35*. *H. x. 26 hinc scopulus raucis pendet adesus aquis* is wrongly rendered 'a cliff hangs over from it, gnawed into by deep-sounding waves.' The Latin for 'a cliff' is *rupes*: the word *scopulus* means 'a peaked rock.' Ovid is describing a projecting rock protruding from the mountain. *H. ii. 118 et cecinit maestum devia carmen avis* is rendered 'the bird that shuns the light chanted her mournful note.' But *devia* means 'solitary.' It is Gray's 'moping owl.' *H. vi. 31 tua facta requirere coepi* is rendered 'I began to ask of your fortunes.' *Coepi* means 'I begin,' and *facta* means 'exploits.' *H. vi. 39, 40 singula dum narrat, studio cursuque loquendi | detegit ingenio vulnera nostra suo* is awkwardly translated 'while part by part he tells the tale, such, in the rushing eagerness of his speech, is his unconscious art that he lays bare my wounds.' *Studio cursuque loquendi* at any rate should be translated 'with eagerness and whirling words.' *Am. I. viii. 62 res est ingeniosa dare* means not 'giving calls for genius' but 'talent shows itself in giving.' *Am. I. ix. 32 ingenii est experientis amor* means not 'love is for the soul ready for any proof' but 'love demands resourceful talent.' *Am. I. x. 15-16 et puer est et nudus Amor; sine sordibus annos | et nullas veste, ut sit apertus, habet* means not 'Love is both a child and naked; his guileless years and lack of raiment are a sign that he is free,' but

'Love is a child and naked; a child without greed, unclothed to show his simple heart.' *Am.* I. xii. 24 *cognitor* means not a 'judge' but an 'attorney.' The translation of *H.* vi. 83-88 is especially unsatisfactory:

nec facie meritisque placet, sed carmina novit
diraque cantata pabula falce metit.
illa reluctantem cursu deducere lunam
nititur et tenebris abdere solis equos;
illa refrenat aquas obliquaque flumina sistit;
illa loco silvas vivaque saxa movet.

'Her charm for you is neither in her beauty nor her merit; but you are made hers by the incantations she knows, by the enchanted blade with which she garners the baleful herb. She strives with the reluctant moon, to bring it down from its course in the skies, and makes hide away in shadows the steeds of the sun; she reins the waters in, and stays the down-winding stream; she charms life into trees and rocks, and

moves them from their place.' The plurals *meritis* and *flumina* become singulars; the meaning of *nititur* and *viva* are misapprehended. I should translate the lines: 'Not by her beauty and deserts does she win your favour, but she is skilled in spells and cuts deadly grasses with enchanted knife. She assays to draw down the unwilling Moon from her course, and hide the Sun's horses in darkness; she curbs the waters and stays winding rivers; she moves forests and virgin rocks from their place.' *Viva* means 'natural,' not 'artificial.' It is unpleasant to pick holes. These remarks are offered in the hope that revision in a later edition may remove faults from a version on which much trouble has evidently been bestowed, and which is a spirited attempt to supply a translation for general use of these inimitable poems.

S. G. OWEN.

WEIDMANN'S SERIES.

- (1) *Quintiliani*, liber X., erkl. von E. BONNELL; 6te Aufl. von H. RÖHL.
(2) *Vergils* Gedichte erkl. von TH. LADEWIG, C. SCHAPER und P. DEUTICKE. II. Buch I.-VI. der *Äneis*. 13te Aufl., bearb. von PAUL JAHN. 341 pp. M. 3.20.
(3) *M. Tullii Ciceronis* Orator erkl. von W. KROLL. 228 pp. M. 2.80.
(4) *Ciceros* Reden: Phil. III.-VI. 120 pp.; Phil. VII.-X. 121 pp. M. 1.20 each volume.
(5) *Sophokles* erkl. von F. W. SCHNEIDEWIN und A. NAUCK; *Aias*, 10te Aufl., neue Bearb. von L. RADERMACHER, 196 pp.; *Antigone*, 11te Aufl., besorgt von EWALD BRUHN. M. 2.20 each.
(6) *Cornelius Nepos* erkl. von K. NIPPERDEY, in 11ter Aufl. besorgt von K. WITTE. M. 3.40.
(7) *Thukydides* erkl. von J. CASSEN. Zweites Buch. 5te Aufl., bearb. von J. STEUP. 330 pp. M. 3.60.

EXCEPT the Quintilian, which is a school edition, these books will be useful to mature scholars. I propose to call attention very briefly to certain notable features.

(2) It is worth while to keep this edition of *Aen.* I.-VI. beside the longer commentaries, because it puts together in a small space the most important aids to interpretation, so that one can find what one wants at a glance. Jahn's aim is to make it possible 'Vergil aus seinen Mustern und aus sich heraus zu verstehen.' He has added considerably to the general stock of illustrative matter, especially from the *Appendix Vergiliana*. In general he gives references to Vergil himself and quotations from earlier and contemporary poets. The bibliography of recent writings (p. 311) is useful; mention is made there and also in the Preface of Roiron's *Étude sur l'imagination auditive de Virgile* (Paris, 1908), 'ein sehr bedeutendes Werk über Vergils Selbstbenutzung.'

(3) Kroll's commentary on the *Orator*, appropriately dedicated to Skutsch's memory, is a new book replacing that of Otto Jahn. His special aim has been, he tells us, 'Ciceros rhetorische Theorie aus der Geschichte der griechischen Rhetorik zu erklären und die griechischen Aequi-

valente für seine Terminologie zu finden.' His notes on syntax, style, and rhythm are remarkably good. In the Introduction (p. 13) he gives reasons for supposing that Cicero's interesting remarks on grammatical questions in §§ 149-164 are borrowed from Varro. There are unfortunately many misprints, some of them of a troublesome kind, and the Index is incomplete; e.g., in § 9, the text has *ea quae sub oculos ipsa non cadunt*, the note has *eaque* as though Heerdegen's conjecture *eaque sub . . . non cadit* had been adopted; similarly, in § 183, the text has *quamquam . . . videtur*, but the note says that we have no right to change the MS. reading *videatur*, and refers to Cic. *Fin.* III. 10, and this again is doubtless a misprint for III. 70 (*Quamquam . . . alii dicant*). There is a vast amount of learning in the book, but it is not easy to find one's way in the crowded notes.

(4) Sternkopf's edition of *Phil.* III.-X. is also a new piece of work continuing Halm's edition of *Phil.* I.-II. Sternkopf is specially qualified for his task by his researches into the history of the times, published in *Philologus* and *Hermes* (notably the article on 'Die Verteilung der römischen Provinzen vor dem Mutinensischen Kriege,' *Hermes*, 1912). The notes treat chiefly of the subject-matter, but the language is not neglected.

(5) The *Ajax* contains a general

introduction to Sophocles, with some interesting remarks (pp. 15-21) on the language of tragedy. Mention may be made also of the list of recent writings (p. 5) which Radermacher has found useful. Bruhn is best known in this country by his admirable edition of the *Bacchae* in this series. Of Sophocles he has now edited *O.T., Ant., El.* He has also published an 'Anhang,' or Supplement, on the language of Sophocles, a handy little book of 170 pp. (Syntax 110 pp., Stilistik 32 pp., Lexicograph. etc. 20 pp.), in which one can easily find one's way with the help of the Contents and Indices. In the notes to the plays space is often saved by reference to this volume.

(6) The Cornelius Nepos, which now covers 300 pp.—the 8th edition has only 190 pp.—is useful both as to language and subject-matter. The Greek authorities are often quoted at length, and there is a good Introduction (29 pp.).

(7) Classen's is a very full commentary, specially useful for the thoroughness of the study of Thucydides' language. Steup revised Book II. for the fourth edition (1889). Since then he has revised Books I. and III.-VII., and the knowledge which he has gained in the course of his work has led him to recast and extend many of the notes.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

St. Paul's School.

EINHARD'S LIFE OF CHARLEMAGNE.

Einhard's Life of Charlemagne. The Latin text edited, with Introductions and Notes, by H. W. GARROD and R. B. MOWAT. 1 vol. 7½" × 5". Pp. lx+82. 1 facsimile (frontispiece) and 1 map. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1915. 2s. 6d. net.

THE *Life of Charlemagne* by his friend and counsellor Einhard enjoys a singular and perhaps exaggerated fame among medieval biographies. Much of this reputation is due to its fortunate subject: a great personality of truth and legend is there enshrined. In the Middle Ages Charlemagne was the chief

traditional hero of Western Europe. Its states were put together from the fragments of his Empire. Right and law and political conceptions were traced back to him. The deeds of his paladins, the rise and decay of his house, were the most widely spread theme of poem and tale. Nor does the modern historian rate him lower. The Emperor sums up and closes the age of the intermingling of two populations, the barbaric Teutons and the once civilised Latins. From his time on, we may say, the civilisation of the West is not a co-existence of jarring and disintegrating elements; it becomes

a true compound of them, a new unity developing in ways not inharmonious till it reaches its full growth in modern times. And on the course of medieval political life Charlemagne exercised a decisive influence. It was by his creation of the Holy Roman Empire that St. Augustine's ideal of the City of God on earth received its first medieval embodiment and was united, in startling contrast to St. Augustine's view, with the memory of the peace and order and unity associated with the ancient Roman Empire. The dispute between Popes and Emperors for the rule over Christendom thus conceived had not begun in his day, but he prepared the material arena by his annexation of the Lombard Kingdom, and set the problem in political theory which each Power solved in its own fashion.

Einhard's work, too, has merits of its own which are specially obvious to a modern reader. It has classic form and proportion; it is not a straggling narrative, but a skilfully arranged and clear presentment of the man and his achievements. Its hero-worship gives it warmth and vigour. Its Latinity is good for its own time, and immeasurably superior to that of later centuries. Yet there are notable defects, too. The pure Latinity is obtained by continual imitation of Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars*, and hence, perhaps, though the energies and habits of Charlemagne stand out clearly, for those small matters of word and thought by which a character becomes humanly alive we have to go to other sources. The King's jokes, for instance, could hardly be translated into a Suetonian mosaic. Further, Einhard's reserved method becomes absolute *suppressio veri* when he deals with the more questionable acts of his hero's political career. Curiously enough, it becomes also the means by which Einhard seems to show his inner dislike of the new-fangled Empire which was amalgamated with the ancient kingdom of the Franks. He calls Charlemagne preferably 'rex' (e.g. in his Introduction); he relegates the assumption of the Empire among the details of the King's devout acts, and records (truly or not) Charlemagne's own aversion to

the event. He urges his own 'barbaric' (i.e. German) extraction with a kind of proud humility. The fact may be that Einhard was a German Frank from beyond the Rhine, and sympathised with those counsellors of Charlemagne, such as Alcuin, who wished to unite the theocratic rule of orthodox Christendom—the City of God on earth under the Lord's Anointed, *Christus Domini*—with the kingdom of the Franks, and regarded the Roman Empire as the embodiment of the man-made state—founded by Nimrod, and once heathen and persecuting.

This attitude of Einhard may be the cause of the one serious lack in the sketch of Charlemagne's government, which Messrs. Garrod and Mowat give in the Introduction to their new edition of the *Vita Karoli*. They do not describe that epoch-making conception of the lay theocracy, although they justly emphasise the importance of the religious motive in Charlemagne, and state elsewhere in a note the influence of the *Civitas Dei* on his reign. For all that, the Introduction is excellent for its appraisal of Einhard as a biographer, and its clear description of the King's administration. Some exception may be taken to the statement on p. xlvii that the Papal States were not within the Empire. The Emperor, to whom the Pope performed 'adoration,' and who received the fealty of the Romans, could hardly be less than the ultimate sovran of the Papal States, however he might admit their extraordinary immunity.

The text, which is all but identical with that of Waitz-Holder-Egger, is accompanied by an admirable Apparatus Criticus which gives the variations of the best exemplars of the three families into which the MSS. are divided. The editors truly claim a superior clearness and effectiveness for this selection, compared with the bewildering host of variants assembled by Waitz. Yet it should be remembered that the valuable division of the MSS. into families was due to the collation of numerous exemplars.

The notes provide a useful, practical commentary, very far from 'viewiness' and over-subtlety. The occasional

translations are helpful and graceful, if once or twice they miss the medieval accent, as when 'divinitus provisa' appears as 'over which Providence itself seemed to watch.' A medieval had no doubts as to whether the divine protection was given or not. To sum up, the edition is an excellent one for the student. For further research Waitz-Holder-Egger is still necessary.

A few misprints and oversights may be noted for a future issue:

P. xiii. It appears to be unproved that the *Vita* was already in Sindileozes-Auua (or Reichenau) monastery in 821 (see Wibel, *Beiträge zur Kritik der Annales Regum Francorum*, pp. 219-27), and to be clear that the *Vita* was finished after 817 (*id.* pp. 214-15).

P. xiii. 'In pago qui dicitur Moingewi' (Walahfrid) does not mean 'at the village of Moingewi,' but 'in the district or county of Moingewi,' i.e. the Maingau (see Spruner-Menke, map 34), whither Einhard retired and where he died.

Pp. xlv and xlv. For 'Hungarians' read 'Avars.'

P. 14, § 2, l. 4. It seems that 'maximo' should be received into the text, since C. also has it (see Waitz-Holder-Egger, p. 60, Corrigenda).

P. 25, l. 2 from bottom. It seems that C. has correctly 'tum' (see Waitz-Holder-Egger, p. 60, Corrigenda).

P. 51, chap. viii., § 1. For 'Elus' read 'Clus.'

P. 55, § 3. The Esthonians are Finnish, not Slavonic. Einhard makes here a correct distinction.

P. 60, § 4. Some further explanation might be given of the East Roman suspicion 'imperium eis eripere vellet.'

P. 62, § 5. For 'MSS.' read 'MS.'

P. 67, l. 4 from bottom. For 'Alcuin' read 'Einhard.'

P. 69, l. 8. For 'Vienna' read 'Ravenna.'

P. 73, § 2. It should be mentioned that the *Chronicon Novaliciense* was not written till circa 1060, and that its charmingly ingenuous author is peculiarly given to a fabulous version of events.

C. W. PREVITÉ ORTON.

Cambridge.

NOTES CRITIQUES SUR LE TEXTE DE FESTUS.

Notes Critiques sur le Texte de Festus.

By LOUIS HAVET. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1914. 2.50 fr.

THIS pamphlet is a fascicule of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Professor Havet has taken occasion of Lindsay's (Teubner) edition to examine a number of passages in Festus. He begins with a study of the tag *cum ait*, which serves some fifty times to introduce a quotation. It is conventionalised into a mere equivalent for modern inverted commas. On a slapdash reading of Festus one is tempted to strike out these *cum ait* right and left; but on reflexion M. Havet retains all but one, a Virgil quotation at p. 218. 20 (Lindsay's paging). On p. 260. 3, for 'Ploxinum appellari ait Catullus capsum in cisio capsamve cum dixit "gingivas vero ploxini habet veteris"'

Catull. xcvi. 6), he suggests *appellavit*: which is very plausible.

Then follow two series of conjectures, the first of which systematically postulates an omission of a line in the MS. archetype, and is suggested by (M. Havet somewhat paradoxically says 'suggest') Professor A. C. Clark's 'very new and very interesting volume'; the second is miscellaneous. By the nature of the case, a review of such work would be as long as the original; space restricts me to a few general observations and one or two specimen instances which suggest criticisms in turn.

Afranius, 344. 19.

remeligo a Laribus missa sum hanc quae
cursum cohib . . .

M. Fabia is right in supposing 'Remeligo' to be a proper name here, as in Plaut. *Cas.* 804 and *Mil.* 1030 (Leo's correction); and in holding that the verse

must be a *senarius*. M. Havet proceeds to infer that there is a lacuna, and no mere rearrangement of the surviving words is sufficient. So far rightly; but having given

Remeligo . . .

A Laribus missa sum hunc quae cursum
cohibeam

he strangely fails to see two very obvious haplographies. The sentence demands *ego*, which has fallen out after the *igo*; and *Familiaribus*, which has fallen out after *laribus*. Also, to emend the *hanc* of the MS. to *hunc* is too simplistic to be probable. Reconstruct somehow thus—

Remeligo <ego dea sum> namque cursum
cohibeo;

A Laribus <ad>sum missa <Familiari-
bus>.

Ennius, 152. 18.

Si quid me fuerit humanitus *uti* teneatis.

Festus cites it for an example of *me = mihi*.

For *uti* Edd. vulg. read *ut*. M. Havet justly calls this an improbable hypothesis, and suggests *uei = ui*. One would like instance of *ui tenere*. Why not *sustineatis*? He is not at his best when he conjectures (in 182. 17) that

ornatu incedent nobili ignobiles

is a genuine verse, twin to a 'bizarre decasyllable,' also attributed to Laevius

omnes sunt denis syllabis versi.

It may be suggested 'obiter' that in this much disputed lemma *virgo* should read *vulgo*, and *ornamentu* conceals . . . *amictu* rather than *ornatu*; the verse might then run something like this—

vulgo (? non, nunc) amictu incedunt nobili
ignobiles.)

But the hiatus remains suspicious.

In 238. 23, for

et qui fuerit persibus carpenti adstratio

he suggests

et quia fuerit persibus carpenti *adsertatio*.

Sometimes a severer criticism leads him to reject a too facile correction which has long passed muster: e.g. in a tantalising Ennian fragment (Fest. 184. 5)

†Veluti si† quando uinclis venatica †uenenot
†xapta† solet, si forte <feras> ea (corr. Mueller,
for ex) nare sagaci
sensit, uoce sua nictit ululatque ib acute.

For *ueneno xapta* Turnebus read *velox apta*. M. Havet rightly remarks that some noun meaning a species of dog is required. But a study of Seneca's *Thyestes*, 497-503, where the same simile is developed, while confirming this remark (Seneca's hound is *Umbra sagax*) suggests others: '†veluti si quando†' may represent *ut uestigando*; also, instead of <feras>, the missing word may be recoverable from *sua* in the line below, to wit *suem* (cf. Seneca's 'dum procul lento *suem* odore sentit'). Anyhow, the plural is queer in *feras*; but unless we adopt a plural, Mueller's *ea* for *ex* fails. The outline of the phrase might be sketched conjecturally as—

ut uestigando uinclis uenatica < . . . >
apta solet, si forte <suem> (?) mox nare sagaci
sensit, uoce [sua] <levi> nictit, etc.

Among M. Havet's happiest strokes of invention one might quote 318. 35 'quid ego facerem tum otiosus?' 'Trudebam rutabulum.' And 318. 374 *scilicet* for *ea licet*. Our lexicons are enriched by a very plausibly recovered word, *redhostimen* (334. 11).

On the whole he is perhaps rather the slave of his own rules as set forth in his Manual; and though he does allow a few exceptions in his own favour, he is apt to quote the rule as decisive against other people. Festus is not a popular author; but there is a certain fascination in the game of patching rags until you elicit the pattern of a piece; and if M. Havet cannot be pronounced to have scored many certain hits, he suggests some valuable clues.

J. S. P.

SHORT NOTICES

Hamlet and Orestes, a Study in Traditional Types. By GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt. (British Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture for 1914). Oxford University Press. 1s. net.

LONG ago, before the Eniautos-Daimon began to haunt the earth, we remember being told a tale of two little boys who wanted the same ball and fought over it till one of them knocked the other down and made off with the ball. But getting his own way, we were reminded, did not make him happy. Later, when we grew older, we read the same story in books, only the little boys were grown up and fought for queens instead of balls, and their names were Agamemnon and Aegisthus and Paris. And sometimes there came into the story a young man, the son maybe of the worsted hero, to whom it fell to restore the balance of right and wrong. Not without suffering either, since he might be called on to do justice on his own mother, as in the case of Orestes and Hamlet.

We begin with recalling these tales, not because we would deny the significance of the return of springtime and the dependence of mankind on a good harvest, but because there is a tendency just now towards turning the Eniautos-Daimon into a kind of Motive-of-all-work. We grant him the stories of Death and Re-birth, but we believe that there are motives which move mankind which are quite disconnected with the succession of the seasons. Professor Murray has worked out a very striking parallel between the legend of Orestes and the Hamlet saga. He compares them with other primitive legends and asks: 'What is the common element in all these stories? You will doubtless have recognised it. It is the worldwide ritual story of what we may call the Golden-Bough kings.' He quotes Usener as having 'identified Orestes as a Winter God, a slayer of the summer.' He may have been, a very long time ago, but there is a danger of

working these useful motives, like the useful member of a committee, too hard.

This study of the Orestes and Hamlet stories leads Professor Murray to the main contention of his lecture—namely, that there are certain traditional subjects 'repeated quite unconsciously by generation after generation of poets.' 'In artistic creation, as in all the rest of life, the traditional element is far larger, the purely inventive element far smaller, than the unsophisticated man supposes.' In plays like *Hamlet* or the *Electra* we have underlying the 'fine and flexible character study,' 'the varied and well-wrought story . . . an undercurrent of desires and fears and passions, long slumbering yet eternally familiar, which have for thousands of years lain near the root of our most intimate emotions and been wrought into the fabric of our most magical dreams.' Here we have the poet interpreting the poets, and under his guidance set forward in the underworld of traditions upon new quests.

M. P.

Nekuia, Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrus-Apokalypse. Von ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Zweite Auflage. Gr. 8. XIV. 238. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1913. Geh. M. 6; geb. M. 7.50.

THE first edition of this book, of which the present is an exact reprint, appeared in 1893. The Akhmim fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter had then been recently discovered, and had aroused much interest. The book endeavoured to put the fragment into its right place as a specimen of purely Hellenic thought in the Christian Church of the second century. In the descriptions of heaven and hell given in this Apocalypse, Christian imagination took its first steps along the road that led it eventually to the Divine Comedy. But the colours of the description are in no sense Jewish; rather are they drawn directly

from Greek sources. The bulk of the book is taken up with an account of Greek thought on the subject of the dead, special attention being paid to the teaching of the mysteries, and the Orphic and Pythagorean books. A short section is devoted to Jewish Apocalypses.

During twenty years historical science has not stood still, and especially in the subjects treated here great progress has been made. The editor has contented himself with prefixing a few pages of notes, in which references are given to recent literature and a few corrections made. No doubt this was the best that could be done under the circumstances. Some of the notes have been furnished by the author's widow from his own copy. But it is a pity that no attempt was made to indicate the great advance made of late years in our knowledge of the Jewish Apocalypses, in the light of which Dieterich's section on the subject seems now very inadequate. It is not necessary to deny Greek influence, but still the Apocalypse can be more naturally explained as the continuation on Christian soil of a type of literature which had long been naturalised in the Jewish Diaspora. A cursory glance at the second volume of the Oxford *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (ed. Charles) provides a number of close parallels, none of which apparently are noticed in either text or prefatory notes of the present edition: 1 Enoch liii. 3; lxi. 9-11. Fragment of the Book of Noah cvi. 2, 10. 2 Enoch (= Slavonic Enoch) i. 5; vii.; viii.; x.

This is, however, but a minor criticism. The book possesses considerable interest, and the great number of original passages quoted in full give it a permanent value.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Sophocles' Electra. Arranged for Amateur Performance. By ELSIE FOGERTY. Crown 8vo. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1915. Price 6d. net; Costume edition, 2s. 6d. net.

THE *Electra* of Sophocles is an astonishingly good acting play. It is

strange that a drama in which only one character has not committed a murder or helped to plot one should so completely grip our attention and so considerably keep our sympathy, and this although the heroine is not fascinating and the hero little more than a divinely-directed automaton. It is well that there should be an English acting edition, and this one has an introduction, with good practical hints on staging and costume, and a certain number of helpful stage directions. The play is reduced in length by about seventy lines mostly in the stichomythia. In the choruses the translator, guided by Dr. Bantock's music, has kept fairly near to the metres of the original Greek: in the translation of the iambics she has kept nearer to Jebb's prose rendering than her excuse in the preface 'for disregarding the fine and scholarly translations already in existence' would lead us to expect. In fact, she has often merely 'hitched' Jebb into blank verse, and the frequency with which Jebb drops into blank verse himself in individual lines has sometimes spared her even this trouble. It is not always easy to accept her stage-directions without dispute: why should the Chorus speak altogether the iambics that follow the Paedagogus' speech, while the First Stasimon is directed to be 'sung alone by leader as a Pythoness'? Again, what happens to the funeral dancers who enter at the end of the Kommos to dance for Orestes as we are told 'before they begin enter Chrysothemis running'? We are never told whether they begin, or whether they ever go away. It would be well too to suggest that the Chorus show some interest while hearing of the chariot-race. Something serious has happened to the headings of the pages, as the whole play is apparently divided into a Parodos and three Kommoi, the 2nd and 3rd Kommoi being inaccurate names anyhow. Misprints in punctuation and spelling should be corrected. The punctuation has gone to pieces in part of Clytaemnestra's prayer, and we find such mistakes as Erynis, Lybian, Crisea and 'son's' for (apparently) 'sure' (l. 966) and 'less' for 'loss' (l. 1298). Aegisthos is an inconsistent spelling,

and it is difficult to know how to scan
Phanoteus in the lines :

Phanoteus, the Phocian, gave me charge,
and

Sent by Phanoteus, their closest ally.

With a more careful avoidance of error
the book would be really useful for
those for whom it is intended—amateur
performers.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

Can any of your more learned readers explain to me the meaning of this effusion, which appeared in *The Times* of July 20 following a notice of the lamented R. W. Raper :

Ἐννέα δὴ γενεῶν σὺ μαθητῶν νόον ἔγνων
Νέστωρ, οἷ σ' ἔλαβον τοῦ βίου ἡγεμόνα·
πολλοὺς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψας
καὶ σε, πρὸς οἷς ἐφίλει, μάρψεν ὁμῶς Θάνατος,
χρῆν γὰρ ἀλαζόμενοις ἂν' ἀσφοδελὸν λειμῶνα
ἡγεμόνος τεύξαι σείο καὶ ἐν φθιμένοις.

It is elegiac in form, but largely epic in diction. It might have been more so, if *μαθητῶν* had had its proper accompaniment *γενεῶν* ; but metre seems to have prevented this. Still, I recognise without difficulty in the opening line a distinct trace of *Od.* i. 3, and in l. 3 there is certainly sufficient evidence of the influence of *Il.* i. 3, though I feel quite unable to decide whether *πολλοὺς* should be regarded (1) as a resolute attempt of the author's to amend Homer's grammar, (2) as merely a Temporal or Northcliffian aberration, or (3) as a triumph of printer's diabolism.

But these are mere trifles, and I pass on to

the gist of my inquiry. What am I to make of the last couplet? What does it mean? What is the construction?

χρῆν τεύξαι = 'ought to have made.' But who neglected this obvious duty? Was it the ἀλαζόμενοι or Θάνατος?

Then ἡγεμόνος, the partitive genitive, suggests an American authorship, 'some guide,' i.e. 'no end of a guide,' not a Greek idiom, I fancy. But what in the world does ἀλαζόμενοισι mean? Where does it come from? There is no such word in the Lexicon, unless the author reached it from ἀλαζών, 'an impostor,' 'a humbug,' regarded as a pres. part. act. and so 'self-deluding' or perhaps 'braggarts'; but he could not have meant this, though I very much suspect that he did think χρῆν should be followed by a dative in epic and elegiac verse. This is not so.

The Latin version which is considerably added throws little or no light on these mysteries :

Credendum est illos, te non duce, nec per
amoenum

Elysii gressus flectere posse nemus.

GRAECULUS.

July 22, 1915.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Demosthenes (Olynthiac Speeches). By J. M. Macgregor. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. lii + 101. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Horace (and his Poetry). With Companion and Glossary. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 135. London: Harrap and Co., 1914. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Naylor (H. D.) More Latin and English Idiom: an Object-Lesson from Livy xxxiv. 1-8. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. viii + 220. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

Sartiaux (F.) Les Sculptures et la Restauration du Temple d'Assos en Troade: avec 59 figures dans le texte. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " Pp. iv + 160. Paris: E. Leroux, 1915.

Virgil (Eclogues and Georgics). Translated by J. W. Mackail. Longmans' Pocket Library. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. viii + 120. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1915. Cloth, 2s. net.

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Ὅσσα IN HESIOD.

THE use of ὅσσα in Hesiod is peculiar to the *Theogony*, and even there it does not mean, as in the Homeric poems, 'rumour,' 'report' (a 282 ὅσσαν ἐκ Διός), or the personification of this, Ὅσσα, the Διὸς ἄγγελος (B 93), but 'voice,' and once 'sound' in general. In the older epic the usual words to express merely vocal sound are φωνή, αὐδή, ἀυτή, and *Φόπα* (*vocem*). It may be worth while to enquire whether the use of ὅσσα in the more general sense is a legitimate development from the earlier and more restricted meaning, or whether any other account can be given of its appearance in the *Theogony*. Let us first of all take a review of the passages:

- 10 ἐννύχαι στείχον περικαλλέα ὅσσαν
 ἰεῖσαι,
43 δώματά τ' ἀθανάτων. αἰ δ' ἄμβροτον
 ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι—
65 ἐν θαλίσῃ· ἐρατην δὲ διὰ στόμα ὅσσαν
 ἰεῖσαι—
67 ἀθανάτων κλείουσιν, ἐπήρατον ὅσσαν
 ἰεῖσαι.
701 ὀφθαλμοῖσι ἰδεῖν ἦδ' οὐασιν ὅσσαν
 ἀκοῦσαι—
832 ταύρου ἐριβρύχῳ, μένος ἀσχέτου,
 ὅσσαν ἀγαύρου.

At first sight the usage would seem to be established beyond all question or shadow of doubt, but a closer investigation of the evidence rather tends to invalidate this conclusion. It is to be noticed that in our first four examples ὅσσα refers to the singing of the Muses; in 701 it connotes the noise, din, crash, of some vast convulsion of nature, and

in 832 it describes the vocal work of a bull, and so is equally remote from any idea of melodious utterance.

If we examine the context of 701, it is fairly obvious that the line is merely a later addition to the passage, breaking the connection between 700 and 702:

καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν Χάος· εἷσατο
 δ' ἅντα
αὐτως ὡς εἰ Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρύς
 ὑπερθε—

Cf. X 410, κ 415 f. That ὅσσαν ἀκοῦσαι is a perverse adaptation from a 282 and β 216 is also evident.

With regard to 832, a similar condemnation is even more inevitable. The four lines 832-5 cannot be the work of the original author of the poem, but of someone not conversant with, or not content to leave undisturbed, the epic use of ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε at the end of a line as an equivalent of 'and reversely,' 'and contrariwise' cf. Σ 472:

ἄλλοτε μὲν σπεύδοντι παρέμμεναι, ἄλ-
 λοτε δ' αὐτε,

'to help him when hard at work, to rest when he rested.'

So here the words immediately preceding—

ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ
φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε
 δ' αὐτε.

contain a complete statement: 'sometimes their utterance was intelligible to the gods, sometimes not.' Thus ran

the description of the vocal powers of the serpent-heads of Typhoeus originally. Then the interpolater expanded it into the trashy fancies of 832-5 with his bull and his lion and his puppies and his whistle, a very loud whistle, of course, ὑπο δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά.

Our remaining four lines all end with *ἰεῖσαι*, and fortunately there is one other line in Hesiod, and in this very passage in the *Theogony* that exhibits that participle, 830:

παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφάτον· ἄλλοτε
μὲν γάρ—

This is enlightening. Why do we find ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι and not ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι? It certainly seems curious that the later Greeks should have preferred to maltreat seriously a familiar participle rather than interfere with an obsolete noun even by aspirating the consonant π. Yet that they did so is clear from the tradition here and *Hymn. Hom.* xxvii. 18, αἱ δ' ἀμβροσίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι, where we have the phenomenon repeated.

Now if we compare this ἀμβροσίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι with 43 ἀμβροτον ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι, the suspicion instantly arises that the latter is merely an evasion of the former expression, the true reading in both cases being:

ἀμβροσίην ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι.

So far, it may be admitted, we have suspicion only, though of a fairly strong character, and capable of being changed into conviction, if further evidence can be found to confirm it or even to add to its probability. For this evidence let us turn to 65:

διὰ στόμα ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι.

A previous investigation, for which see *Homericæ*, ο 109, led me to the conclusion that *διὰ* with the accusative implies movement strictly within the limits of the particular space, and may be rendered 'throughout,' e.g. *διὰ δώματα*: but with the genitive it expresses passage or penetration from end to end, from outside to outside, e.g. *δι' αὐχένος*, *δι' ὤμων*. Here, then, I submit that the appropriate expression is not *διὰ στόμα*, 'in the mouth,' but *διὰ στόματος*, 'out of the mouth.' In Ξ 91:

μῦθον, ὃν οὐ κεν ἀνὴρ γε διὰ στόμα πάμπαν ἄγοιτο

'in' or 'into the mouth' is the meaning; but that sense is inadmissible in our line. It is, I think, almost a necessary conclusion that the original ran thus:

διὰ στόματος ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι.

The very termination of *στόματος* half suggests the supplanting noun to which the objectionable ὅφ' (*ὅπα*) has yielded the position.

Next we have to consider 67 ἐπήρατον ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι. To come to the point at once, I submit that this represents without much ambiguity an original:

ἐπηετανὸν ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι.

There is some doubt whether ἐπήρατος is really a good epic form as a synonym of ἐρατός v. Nitzsch on δ 606; but there can be none that the appearance of both as epithets of ὅσσα within three lines, as here, is an undesirable and unpleasing peculiarity. The suggested ἐπηετανόν, a Hesiodic word, appropriately marks the continuous flow (cf. (ζ 86 πλυνοὶ ἦσαν ἐπηετανοί) of musical utterance, an idea that appears also in the ἀκάματος ῥέει αὐδή of l. 39.

To return for a moment to 43 αἱ δ' ἀμβροτον ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι, it is not unimportant to observe that in this case, our real starting-point, conjectural emendation has not been resorted to, the true reading, or what is assumed to be such, having been preserved *verbatim* with one very small lapse in the tradition of *Hom. Hymn.* xxvii. 18. We have also in the *Theogony* itself, 69 ἀμβροσίην μολπῇ.

It follows, of course, that 10 περικαλλέα ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι cannot in its present form be the work of an early epic writer. *Περικαλλής*, I may remark, is elsewhere always applied to a visible object, and as it is found in about seventy passages in Homer, the anomaly here, to say nothing of the hiatus, is a little surprising. Possibly *περι-* has ousted an original ὅπα here, and ὅπα κάλλιμον may be right, as in μ 192 ἰεῖσαι ὅπα κάλλιμον. A quite tolerable line might be made by

ὅπα κάλλιμον ἐκπροῖεῖσαι.

However, leaving *l. 10* out of the reckoning, counting it as not uninformable to the others and no more, I submit that the above passages, though separately perhaps open to some doubt, yet taken together afford ample and sufficient evidence for the conclusion that *ῥοσα* is an innovation and importation of later times in all these places, and that the desertion of the true Homeric sense of this word, which is apparently characteristic of the *Theogony*,

is not to be attributed to the original author of that work, but affords a striking and valuable example of the extent of the modernisation or popular simplification to which the early epic poetry was subjected by its later unsophisticated custodians, the Homeridae or the whole Hellenic race.

In the *Little Iliad. Fragm. ii. 3* *πῶς ἐπεφωνήσω* should probably be *πῶς ὀπὶ φωνήσω*. Cf. *Homerica*, l. 456.

T. L. AGAR.

A NOTE ON THE WORD ACCENT IN GREEK MUSIC.

GABELENTZ, in his *Sprachwissenschaft*, second edition, p. 377, when speaking of the Chinese tones, makes the following remark: 'Beim Gesange überbleibt der Wortton deutlich vernehmbar. Auch dies spricht für seine Selbständigkeit dem musikalischen Tone gegenüber; denn das Lied wird dadurch nicht misstönend.' Unfortunately he does not explain how this comes about.

Classical Greek also had a musical word accent: at the same time speakers of this musically accented language used to *sing* in it. The question therefore presents itself: Was the musical word accent of ordinary speech completely neglected in singing? If not, how was its presence reconciled with the melody?¹

I think that the answer to these questions may perhaps be found in the specimen of Greek music published by Henri Weil and Théodore Reinach under the title 'Hymne à Apollon'—*Extrait du Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Ecole Française d'Athènes, 1894*.²

The facts at present generally established as to the nature of the Greek accent are as follows:

1. The accented syllable represented a higher tone than the unaccented.
2. The acute (*α*) on a short vowel was a

simple high tone, e.g. *ῥόδός* = $\cup \mid \cup$; (*b*) on a long vowel or diphthong was a high tone on the second mora—e.g. *θεᾶ* = $\cup \mid \cup$.

3. The circumflex was a high tone on the first mora—e.g. *θεᾶς* = $\cup \mid \cup$.

4. The grave probably represented a low tone—e.g. *τῆμης ἄπο* = $\cup \cup \mid \cup \cup \mid \cup \cup$, but *ἀπὸ τῆμης* = $\cup \mid \cup \mid \cup \cup \mid \cup \cup$.

An examination of the above-mentioned piece of music seems to me to show that in musical composition (or, at least, in this example of it) this system of word accentuation was not altogether neglected.

In all there are 94 words of more than one syllable bearing either the acute or the circumflex. In 61 of these the highest note of the word falls on the accented syllable; in 27 the accented syllable is equally high with some other syllable or syllables of the same word; and in 6 only is it lower. That is to say, in 93·7 per cent. of the words the accented syllable is musically higher than, or equally high with, the other syllables.

Out of the 27 cases in which the accented syllable is equally high with another syllable of the same word, in 17 it is followed, in 3 preceded, and in 2 followed and preceded by a lower note. In 1 case the preceding note has not been recovered; and in 4 cases the preceding and following notes are equally high. That is to say, in 84·6 per cent. of these words the accented syllable is either followed or preceded by a lower note.

Of the 6 cases in which the accented

¹ As far as I know this question has not been previously discussed: at least there is no mention of it in the latest edition of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik*.

² In the absence of books of reference I do not know if more pieces have since been discovered.

syllable is lower than another in the same word, in 1 (*δικόρυφον*, d-e-d-f) the accented syllable is preceded and followed by lower notes; in 2 (*δικορύνια*, g-a flat-g-e flat-e flat; *φερόπλοιο*, d flat-c-b-b flat) the accented syllable is followed by a lower note; 1 ([*θε*]ω[*ρ*]ῶν, x-a flat-f) rests upon conjecture, though tolerably certain; 2 only do not seem to admit of any explaining away: *θνατοι-οῖ-ς προφαίνει*, g-d flat-f-g-g-f, [*θα*]λος φίλον, x-g-g-a flat.

If then we make a provisional statement that the accented syllable must be sung on a higher note than either that preceding or following, we find in 94 words only 2 exceptions, a rate of 2.1 per cent.

There are 7 cases in which an acute vowel is sung on two different notes: in 5 the second mora has the higher tone, in 2 the first.

There are 10 cases in which a circumflexed vowel is sung on two different notes: in 9 the first mora has the higher tone, in 1 the second; that is, in comparison with the acute, the case of the circumflex is reversed. The one exception is *θνατοι-οῖς*, g-d flat-f, already mentioned as an exception in another respect.

Some long unaccented vowels are sung on two different notes. In 5 cases the vowel follows an accented syllable: of these 3 have the higher note on the first mora, 2 on the second. There are 7 cases in which the vowel precedes an accented syllable: of these 6 have the higher note on the second mora, 1 on the first. This is the case of *δικόρυφον κλει-ειτύν*, d-e-d-f-d-b flat-d, where the split syllable follows the highest (though unaccented) syllable of the previous word.

There seems to be no regulation as to the interval between the morae of an acute or circumflex, or between accented and unaccented syllables. The interval varies from a semitone to 5 full tones.

If then conclusions may be drawn from a comparatively small number of examples, they are these:

1. There was a very strong tendency, amounting almost to necessity, to make the accented syllable of the word sung on the highest note, or at least to make it higher than either the preceding, or, preferably, the following syllable.

2. When a long accented vowel was sung on two notes, there was a tendency in the case of acute vowels to make the second mora the higher, in the case of circumflexed vowels a strong tendency to make the first the higher.

This agrees generally with what we know of the nature of these accents.

3. When a long unaccented vowel was sung on two notes, there was a tendency in the case of those preceding an accented syllable to make the second mora the higher, in the case of those following an accented syllable to make the first the higher.

This is in agreement with what we may surmise to have been the nature of the vowels following an accented syllable from a comparison with the Vedic accent. Here an acute (*udatta*) syllable was always followed by a syllable characterised by a falling tone (*svarita*)—that is, a tone of which the first mora (in the case of long vowels) was higher than the second.

R. L. TURNER.

Benares.

ON AN ARCHAIC THESSALIAN EPIGRAM.

IN *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xxxv. (1911), p. 239, No. 8, J. Hatzfeld published an archaic epitaph as from Zarizani near Elassona (Oloösson), which he transcribed as follows:

Νεπία ἔος ἔθανον καὶ οὐ λά[β]ον ἄνθος
 ἔτ' ἔβας,
 ἀλλ' ἰκόμαν πρὸς τὲν πολυδάκρυον εἰς
 Ἀχέρουτα.

μνήμα δὲ τῆιδε πατὲρ Ὑπεράνορος παῖς
 Κλεόδαμος
 στᾶσέ με Θεσσαλῖαι καὶ μάτερ θυγατρὶ
 Κορόνα.

The editor refers in his commentary only to the date of the inscription, which he attributes to the beginning of the fifth century at latest, and to the

metrical irregularities of the last two lines.

In a series of valuable notes on published Thessalian texts, A. S. Arvanitopoulos gives a photographic reproduction of a squeeze of the epitaph in question, which, he maintains, was found at Oloösön itself, and adds further particulars regarding the discovery, the nature and the dimensions of the stele ('*Αρχ. Έφ.* 1913, 180 f.). In two respects his reading differs from that of Hatzfeld. For *πρὸς τὲν* he would substitute *πρόσθεν* (i.e. *πρόσθεν*), though allowing that this form is 'difficult of interpretation' and giving a reference only to 'l. 2 at the end,' which I take to relate to *ἐτ'* in place of *ἐθ'* towards the close of l. 1. This change we must, I think, accept, not only because Hatzfeld's reading is not easily intelligible ('I came to the lady of many tears' must, if retained, refer to the soul's journey to the realm of Persephone), but also because Thessalian inscriptions afford several parallels to this psilosis. It will be sufficient to quote the following cases from *I.G.* ix. 2: *ἐλέστειν* (*ἐλέσθαι*) in 513, *πεπείστειν* (*πεπείσθαι*) in 517 l. 16, *ἀρχιπρουρέϊσας* and *σύμπρουροι* (*ἀρχιφρουρήσας*, *σύμφρουροι*) in 1058, and *Αἰσκυλῖς* in 431. The opposite process is exemplified by the forms *ἐγένουθο* (517 l. 12) and *ἐλόνθο* (513).

Arvanitopoulos' second suggestion is to my mind less happy. Since Hatzfeld's *ἔος* (*ἔως*) gives no sense, he proposes to read *νηπίαεος*, i.e. *νηπίαιος*. To this he himself brings forward one objection, that we should expect a feminine in *-αία* rather than in *-αιος*, but there are three further difficulties on which he does not touch. In the first place, I cannot find that the word *νηπίαιος* exists at all; at least, I have looked vainly for it in Liddell and Scott, the *Thesaurus* and van Herwerden's *Lexicon*. Secondly, it is metrically unsound, and, though this epigram is not lacking in errors of metre,

it is unlikely that the common term *νηπίαχος* should have been passed over in favour of a word which, even if its existence be granted, suits the verse less well. Further, I am not aware that in Thessalian *αι* is represented by *αε*, as it is occasionally in other dialects, as for example in *μαέας* (Brycus, *S.G.D.I.* 4317), *Ἀεάκης* (Samos, *Ath. Mitt.* xxxi. 151 ff.), *Φαενώ* (*Brit. Mus. Cat. Coins: Ionia*, Pl. III. 8), *Ἀθαναέα*, *Περαεόθεν* (Corinth, *S.G.D.I.* 3119 h, i), *Ἀέθων* and *Ἀέθρα* (Kretschmer, *Gr. Vasenschr.* 33 f., 176). It may be that these four objections taken singly would not justify a rejection of Arvanitopoulos' conjecture, but their cumulative force is, I think, considerable.

I am therefore inclined to adhere to the view which suggested itself to me immediately upon reading Hatzfeld's publication, namely that the true reading is *νηπία εἰοῦσ'*. For the form of the participle we may compare two other dialect inscriptions of Thessaly, *I.G.* ix. 2. 506 *ἀντιγραφείος ἐόντος Αἰσχύλοι*, and 517 l. 14 *ἐτ' τοῖ παρεόντος* (*ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος*, l. 6). The inconsistency in the representation or omission of the elided vowels is a common phenomenon and may be paralleled, to give but a single example, in another archaic epitaph of Thessaly, *I.G.* ix. 2. 255.

Corona is the name of the deceased girl's mother: the existence of a corresponding masculine form *Coronus* is attested by the patronymic adjectives found in a list of new citizens of Larisa: *Ἀντιφάνεις Κορούνειος*, *Ἀρισ[το]φάνεις Κορούνειος* (*I.G.* ix. 2. 517 ll. 57, 58). The formation of the daughter's name, *Thessalia*, is paralleled by that of the names *Ἑλλάς* (*I.G.* ix. 2. 423, 538) and *Μακεδονία* (*ibid.* 538, 563), to cite but two instances which occur in Thessaly itself. Other examples are given in Bechtel - Fick, *Griech. Personennamen*, 347 ff.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College.

CATULLUS, LXXXIV.

IN the August number of the *Classical Review*¹ Mr. A. J. Bell throws welcome light on *Catulli nobile epigramma*. I have long thought, as Mr. Bell thinks, that an epigram, especially if it is by Catullus, should grow to a point; and lately I have guessed, as Mr. Bell guesses, at the origin of the over-aspiration which Catullus ridicules and Quintilian records.² Let me give my views in friendly rivalry with Mr. Bell. *σύν τε δὴ ἐρχομένω.*

The poem owes its order and its spare aspirates to Politian. What we read as the second couplet comes in the manuscripts fifth, where it is badly in the way.³ As for the aspirates, the manuscripts have *commoda* twice in the first line, no *chommoda*; and the most and best of them are just as innocent of *hinsidias* in what is now and rightly the fourth line, and of *Hionios* at the end.⁴ In the second line, however, the three manuscripts that matter have readings which deserve more attention than they have received. O ends the line with *insidias hee*, G and R with *insidias he*, though in R the *he* has been struck out.⁵

What are we to make of *hee* and *he*? Friedrich, of course, knows all about them. 'Some scribe, who did not understand Catullus's banter, had written in the margin *hahe* or *hahahe* (= *hahae*, *hahahae*), of which *hee* and *he* are the remains.' A scribe who read the poem as it appears in our manuscripts might well hum and haw, but I doubt if he would guffaw; the humour of the scribes of

Catullus, though plentiful, is unconscious.

Thanks to Quintilian, we know more or less where the aspirates should be put in. *Chommoda* we must have, and in one of the other words the aspirate was probably initial; but why in both, and, if not in both, in which? O G R point not to *hinsidias* but to *insidiash*, where *sh* would not be pronounced as in 'smash,' but might denote some weak fricative with a sound halfway between *s* and *h*, somewhat as the Northumbrian burr is halfway between *r* and *h*. If that is what Catullus meant, he may not have been sure how his readers would take the unfamiliar combination of letters, and possibly he helped matters by writing *insidias he*, which we find in G R. Let no one object that then the line would not scan.

For this decay of final *s* I know no such evidence as Quintilian's for the other two faults; but something may be inferred from the history of Latin and Greek. Ancient Greek is full of words whose initial *s* has become the rough breathing, which means nothing in the Greek of to-day. In other Greek words medial *s* has been lost; the Laconian forms *παᾶ*, *Μῶᾶ*, *Ποοῖδάν*, show a half-way stage. Plato¹ reckons sigma among the 'windy' letters, with phi, psi, zeta. Final *s* had a precarious existence in Latin from early times, and on the way to Italian it has been altogether lost. We may conjecture that such processes began with the decay which I suppose, *s-h*; that the *h* came to prevail over the *s*; and that lastly the *h* was lost in its turn.

But the question between *hinsidias* and *insidias-h* is by the way. The trouble about the poem is that it has all the look of rising to a climax, yet falls miserably flat. Even with the help of Mr. Bell the last couplet does not draw from me a *hahahae*.

A clue is given by *horribilis*. What had happened was something to shudder or shiver at. To be brief, I guess that the last word of the poem should be

¹ Pp. 137-139.

² See the Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, February 10, 1910, and November 5, 1914.

³ Doubtless the occurrence of the same word at the end of the first and second couplets led to omission, a marginal supplement, and insertion in the wrong place.

⁴ One MS. (d) is said to have *hinsiadas* in l. 4; another (p), which embodies some conjectures made in the fifteenth century, has *hyonios* in l. 12. D has *ionios*; but D dates from 1463, and the *h* may have been added after Politian's restoration of the poem.

⁵ L, which draws some things from O, has *insidias haec*, probably from misreading O's *hee* as *hec*. Schulze's M, which Hale has shown to be a copy of R, has *hinsidias*, forestalling Politian so far, it seems.

¹ *Crat.* 427A (πνευμάτωδῃ τὰ γράμματα . . . ὅταν πού τὸ φυσῶδες μῆγται . . .).

χιονέους. When Arrius crossed, his aspirates blew up a blizzard, and the sea has been snow-swept ever since.

Here it will certainly be objected that then the line will not scan. I am not so sure. In modern Greek, to an English ear, χ is just *h* and no more. How soon it degenerated from *kh* I cannot tell, but the process was probably gradual, and in the time of Catullus the sound may have been *h* to a Roman ear if not to a Greek. That the Latin poets, when they were not punning, still treated χ as *ch* in their loans from Greek, is no matter; they knew how the Greek poets treated it (even as we know how French treats its so-called aspirate, though we wonder why), and they followed suit. However, if a critic had been rash enough to point out the metrical flaw, Catullus might have answered in the words of Rhinthon,

ὁ σὲ Διόνυσος αὐτὸς ἐξώλη θείη.
Ἰππώνακτος τὸ μέτρον. οὐδέν μοι μέλει,

or in the spirit of Artemus Ward,
'N.B.—This is a goak.'

If χιονέους is right, it gives us an initial aspirate in disguise. If *insidias-h* also is right, Catullus gives Arrius aspirates in three different places, whereas with the *hinsidias* and *Hionios* of our texts he plays the same trick twice.

It is sad work explaining another man's jokes, especially so frigid a joke as this. Let us turn to comparative philology, a gayer theme.

To the best of Mr. Bell's knowledge and mine, nobody has explained whence the vulgar vice of over-aspiration arose. Like Mr. Bell I suspect some influence from outside, though such changes of speech are often, I dare say, of native growth. Mr. Bell is for Etruscan as the outside influence; I am for Venetic.

The scanty remains of the Venetic language have recently been enriched

and expounded¹ by Professor R. S. Conway. Here is an inscription on a votive nail:

e.χetor e.r.iimonelo meχo zona.s.to śahnateh
rehtiaih porah .u.zeropho.s

Venetic has aspirates here, there, and everywhere: aspirated consonants written with the Greek letters $\theta \phi \chi$; such sequences of letters as *vh*, *ahs*, *ht*, *hn*; and, above all, many words ending in *ah*, *eh*, *oh*. When speakers of Venetic, or their descendants, took to Latin, no wonder they raised a wind.

Now Professor Conway's inscriptions come from Este, Padua, Verona, and Vicenza. To Verona belonged Catullus, and the other towns are all within fifty miles. Whether Arrius too came from thereabouts we do not know, but we can see that the personalities and topicalities of Catullus, apart from Rome and his excursions to Bithynia and Spain, keep pretty close to his home.² To say nothing of Verona itself, we have Brescia and Como; Alfenus Varus came from Cremona; the Annals of Volusius were to die by the Padua, a mouth of the Po. So Arrius may have come from Venetic parts. Whether the Veneti were as matriarchally minded as Mr. Bell's Etruscans, I cannot say.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ To the British Academy on July 22, 1908; to the Cambridge Philological Society on May 14, 1914 (Proceedings, 1914, p. 6). Professor Conway has very kindly read my paper in manuscript, and has bettered it in more than one place.

² See particularly B. Schmidt's preface to his text. Schmidt collects evidence from Cisalpine inscriptions for the names of several of the poet's friends and foes; and I see that two of Professor Conway's epitaphs from Este have the names *iuvva.n.tsaħ* and *iuvva.n.tiioħ*, which recall the *Juventius* of Catullus.

HORACE AND THE SCHOLIA.

Do we give sufficient attention to the scholia of Acron or of Porphyrio? I know the blunders that occur in both, blunders obvious to any schoolboy. But we have also in these scholia translations and explanations of obscure and difficult passages coming from men who

spoke the poet's language, and who had at their disposal the fruits of study in the intervening centuries. In interpreting the part do we give these their proper value? A consideration of the scholia on Hor. *Ep.* I. v. 3 may help us to answer this question. I have just

been reading in Prof. Courtand's book on the Epistles his account of the Epistle to Torquatus (*Ep.* I. v.), and felt a little disturbed by his insistence on 'the hour of sunset' (*supremo sole*, v. 3). On p. 90 he tells us 'l'invitation est pour le jour même, au coucher du soleil'; and again on p. 100, 'souper ne commençant qu'avec le coucher du soleil, comme il sied entre gens de mœurs régulières.' Really one is not surprised at Orelli's feeling that an invitation to a banquet so little out of tune with the rules of Roman propriety hardly justified such strictures on economy as we find in v. 12: *Parcus ob heredis curam nimiumque severus adsidet insano*. For a like reason Ribbeck, a much keener critic of Roman poetry than the Romans themselves, was for banishing vv. 12-20 as having no proper motion in the Epistle.

There are other reasons for questioning the translation of *supremo sole* by 'the hour of sunset.' If it is sunset, there is surely no need for Torquatus' leaving his house by a back-door to avoid the client waiting in the hall (v. 31); for the court has been closed these couple of hours. Or is the mention of the *clientem atria servantem* merely a jocular way of emphasising the fact that the hall of this distinguished advocate is always filled with clients? But *rebus omissis* (v. 30)? Surely, now that the court is closed, we should rather expect *rebus confectis*? For there is to be no court on the morrow, and the 'light hopes and struggles for riches and the case of Moschus' that Torquatus is to leave (*mitte* in v. 8 is for *omitte*) is the poet's way of describing the business of to-day. But it is not fitting to bid him desert this business at sunset; it would be finished by that time. I turn to the scholia, and read in Acron: *Supremo te sole, Hoc est: Cum est altissimus medio die, ut supreme Juppiter*; and in Porphyrio: *Supremo, summo, id est, hora sexta*. At once all the difficulties we have noted disappear. The client guarding the hall, and the abandonment of the day's business are at once explained. There is no occasion for Orelli's worry over Horace's lecture to Torquatus on his too great zeal for gain; none for Ribbeck's feel-

ing that vv. 12-20 have no sufficient motive in the rest of the Epistle. Horace is not playing the moral prig; on the contrary, he is begging Torquatus to violate the proprieties for once and join him at noon, throwing over all business for the day. The tie of friendship, which would justify this, must have been close of course; it was to Torquatus that Horace addressed Ode IV. 7 (*diffugere nives*), an ode so thrilled with regret for the shortness of life and of such high poetic quality, that we may well believe the tie of friendship that called it forth one of the closest. Why the interpretation of the scholia has been rejected by all the editors I know, it is difficult to see. It is quite true that in prose *summus* is usually 'highest,' and *supremus* 'last.' But poetry often takes the opposite meaning from prose; and Horace has here used *supremus* for 'highest' just as in the first verse of his first Epistle he used *summus* for 'last.' He tells us in his *Ars Poetica* (vv. 47-48): *Dixeris egregie notum si callida verbum reddiderit iunctura novum*. When (*Ep.* II. 1. 70) he calls his old schoolmaster *plagosus*, the fact that till then *plagosus* had the meaning 'subjected to many blows' did not disturb him; for he felt sure that the *callida iunctura* with Orbilius would make his meaning clear. Here, too, he trusted that the *cliens atria servans*, the *res omissae*, his pleading with Torquatus not to value fame and money more than the enjoyment of life with a friend, would make the *supremo sole* clear to his readers, as in fact they did to his readers in Rome. It is a similar use of *cessatum* for *qui cessavit* which has led to so much difficulty and doubt about the reading of the Blandinian codex—*cessatum ducere somnum* (*Ep.* I. 2. 31), where *ducere* is poetic for *reducere*. The adjective or participle ending in *-tus* is very much older than the passive voice, and is primarily often active in meaning, e.g. in Skt. *gatus*, 'having come.' So both Horace and Virgil feel free to use it in the older active sense at times, e.g. *per sanctum iuratus* . . . Osirim (*Ep.* I. 17. 60) or *titubata solo* (*Aen.* V. 332). Indeed forms like *potus*, *pransus*, *obsoletus* are usually so used.

So in *Ep.* II. 1. 244: Boeotum in crasso iurares aere natum. I see that the explanation *Boeotum* = *Βοιωτῶν*, given first to my knowledge by Kiessling, meets with much favour. I turn to Acron's scholium, and read: Boeotum. id est, quem libet ex Boeotia. And this is confirmed by the close connection we so commonly find between the first and last words of a Latin verse, a connection which is often lost sight of in translating:

Virtus est vitium fugere et sapientia prima
Stultitia caruisse (*Ep.* I. 1. 41).

That the testimony of the scholia is of importance in determining the text is, no doubt, a commonplace to editors; and yet in *Ep.* I. 19. 10, all editors, to my knowledge, read *Hoc simul edixi*. Porphyrio and most of the MSS. give *edixi*, but I read in Acron: simul edixi, alii edixit. How can the intelligent reader fail to see how much better *edixit* is here? It is evidently a question of a praetor issuing a decree; and how much more natural it is to make Ennius the praetor (*i.e.* the leader) of Roman poets, especially when the decree is a prohibition of sobriety! That Horace could have written *edixi*, and so proclaimed himself the leading Roman poet at the time when he wrote this epistle, seems an impossibility when we recall his attitude to Virgil. (Since writing the lines above I have read with pleasure M. Courtand's note on p. 319 of his book,¹ where he characterises *edixi* as *une faute de goût*.) Indeed when the scholia join with the MSS. in supporting a reading it seems to me assured. And that is why I felt grieved when in his *Horatiana* of your May number, I read Mr. Gow's characteristic of *honoratum* (*A.P.* 120) as 'foolish.' Both Acron and Porphyrio agree with the MSS. in reading *honoratum*. And Kiessling's explanation of *honoratum* here shows that, far from being foolish, it is quite natural and fully justified. In *A.P.* 128-9 Horace speaks of basing dramatic compositions on the *Iliad*: 'tuque rectius *Iliacum carmen* deduces in actus.' A tiro might translate *Iliacum carmen* as 'the *Iliad*,'

but a thoughtful student will see at once what nonsense it is to talk of spinning out the twenty-four books of the *Iliad* into five acts. *Iliacum carmen* will be as much of the *Iliad* as a rhapsode can well recite at one time, and will correspond to 'a book of the *Iliad*.' That a play might well be based on a single book of the *Iliad* will not appear strange when we think of the Chryses of Pacuvius. Among all the books of the *Iliad* that which comes nearest dramatic form is the ninth, in which Agamemnon tries to restore to Achilles the honour he took from him in the first, and Achilles in rejecting his proposals shows himself 'impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer.' *Honoratum* seems to me a very natural term, if used to describe the hero of a drama based on the ninth *Iliad*.

I do not think that Mr. Gow will bear me any grudge when I tell him that I prefer what Horace has written to the emendations he suggests in his *Horatiana*. Let him consider with me for a moment the state of things if the gods took him seriously and blotted out the Horatian words he has chosen to emend, substituting his corrections. Mr. Gow would write *an orator* instead of *honoratum*. It is quite likely that the younger Piso was studying rhetoric, as Mr. Gow suggests; all noble Roman youths did so at the time. But would Horace venture on any part in this instruction? He was not a noble Roman, and we have not the slightest reason to suppose that he ever delivered an oration in Rome: what he may have done in Athens or with his legion is another question. Let me turn to Mr. Gow's *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*. He would read in *Carm.* II. 20. 6. *jocas* for *vocas*, 'when you make fun of' or 'banter me,' and he calls attention to Suetonius' tale of how Augustus bantered Horace. But that Maecenas' ridicule of Horace was of the same kindly character we may be permitted to doubt when we recall how he substitutes *stomacheris* for 'rides' in his first epistle. But 'to banter' implies a *habit*, or at least a process, and not an isolated momentary act, and in Latin that should be expressed by the deponent *iocare*, and not by the action *iocas*. *Vocas* does not

¹ Horace, *Sa vie et sa pensée à l'époque des Epîtres*. Hachette, 1914.

mean here 'callest me names,' as Mr. Gow seems to think, but is for *invocas*, 'invitest me to dinner.' Prof. Courtauld has fittingly laid stress on one aspect of the dinners in question (p. 91): 'They did not become so usual in Augustus' day merely to gratify the appetite or display the wealth and taste of the entertainer, but for the Romans of the time they represented the life of society, and were frequented for the sole pleasure of meeting one's friends and holding free converse with them.'

When we turn to Mr. Gow's *Meta-ponticum* we feel still more dubious about his use of the term ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in this connection; he seems to have but little occasion for resorting to the petition: 'Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt.' In this Ode (III. 24. 4) we have no hesitation in accepting the reading of the best MSS., supported by Acron: 'Mare Ponticum Tyrrenum omne. . . . et mare Ponticum' will mean 'our whole system of seas to its extremity in the far East.'

In *Sat. I. 1. 108* Mr. Gow proposes *aut rarus* for *ut avarus*, breaking the record, as he himself owns. The reading *ut avarus* is that of all MSS., and is supported by both scholiasts. Porphyrio's note hardly justifies Mr. Gow in asserting that he makes the miser content; his words are: 'Qui proposito suo gaudeat solus,' and he follows an alternative suggestion of Acron's: 'In eo quod avarus est, sibi placet'—'The miser is satisfied with his aim, but not with his lot.' Most of us will accept Acron's first explanation: 'Quod omnes alienas condiciones laudant, suas vituperant, sed praecipue avarus, qui miserum dicit et egentem;' and in this connection we might notice the far higher value of Acron's Scholia. But I fear Mr. Gow has failed to notice the real subject of *laudat*, which is *omnis* implied in *nemo*. Whether this implication is usual, or even possible, when another numeral, e.g. '*rarus* intervenes,' it is for Mr. Gow to show.

Ut avarus had escaped emendation till Mr. Gow took pen in hand; very different was the case of *bibes* in—

Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno
Tu bibes uvam (*Carm. I. 20. 9-10*)

where again *bibes*, the reading of all the MSS., is confirmed by Porphyrio's Scholium. But the editors have had their difficulties with *bibes*. Keller tried *bibis*, but here the second syllable is short; so he resorted to *tum bibes*; 'After you have tried my cheap wine, you may drink your own Caecuban and Calenian.' But Horace tells us plainly that he has no such wine on his table, and the measure of comfort to Maecenas involved in the prospect that he will be able to drink such wines when he returns to the Esquiline, seems but slight. Munro found *bides* in an Irish MS., and corrects it to *vides*, poetic for *provides*, and Krüger follows the same idea in his *liques*, which has no MSS. support. But one would like to think better of Maecenas, despite his physical delicacy. Mr. Gow suggests *ibes*, and rightly maintains that *ibes* may mean 'order up from the kitchen' or 'from the wine cellar.' But there are no such wines in Horace's cellar; it would be like the great Welshman's call. Those who have followed the sensible plan of retaining *bibes*, backed as it is by such MSS. authority, have had their troubles too. It might be a permissive future, thinks Mr. Gow, if it were not within a few lines of the regular future, *potabis*. I count Mr. Gow happy, who can tell just what future a poet will not venture to place within a few lines of any other future. Prof. Clement Smith thinks it has a concession—hortatory force; and I begin to feel the charm of, say, *suasive*, *predictive*, *commendatory*, but recollect the need of a judicious and temperate use of grammar, especially in dealing with poets. Kiessling compares *laudabunt* (*Carm. I. 7. 1*) 'Their aim will be to praise'; but this seems rather a future of probability, corresponding in a way to the *perfectum logicum*. 'It will be your wish to drink' seems hardly so likely as 'you will wish you had drunk'; and neither phrase seems quite in place in a note of invitation. 'I must leave you to drink,' says Wickham, and compares *Scriberis Vario*, a plain commendatory future. But I fancy that Horace joins in drinking these fine wines with Maecenas when he has the chance. And yet the mean-

ing seemed clear enough to me, when as a boy I first read the Ode. Horace wonders at his daring in inviting Maecenas to come to his Sabine farm and share his rough fare there, when he thinks of his magnificent cheer at Rome, both at table and in the theatre; in the last four verses he again contrasts this cheer with what he has to offer. 'Caecuban and grapes crushed by the Calenian winepress you will be drinking; neither Falerian vines nor the hills of Formiae flavour my cups.' The future seems quite as natural here in the Latin as in the English; but its real nature and force will bear closer definition. The best appreciation of its force here that I have seen, I find in Nauck: '*Bibes* ist hier wenig verschieden von *bibis*, nur weniger zuversichtlich;' *vgl.* I. 7. 1 and 9, *laudabunt* and '*dicet* neben *sunt quibus*' in I. 7. 5.' *Laudabunt* and *dicet* are futures of probability, reasoning from the past to the present and

future; and so is *bibes* here, but it has the present more clearly in view, and indeed is contrasting this present with a future hoped for by the poet and possibly close at hand. We seem, too, to have in this future a transference from distance in time to distance in space. Horace, looking forward to the coming of Maecenas, writes to him: 'Vile Sabinum, quod fundus praestiterit, tu mecum potabis.' The future gives a consummation remote in time; not very remote, the poet hopes. Looking out from his Sabine hill to the distant Esquiline, he writes 'Caecubum bibes'; and by *bibes* he means 'you will now be drinking'; indeed, one feels that he might have written *nunc bibes*, as Catullus wrote *nunc amabit* (VIII. 17), and Horace himself wrote *nunc tempus erat* (Ode I. 37. 4). Distance in space as well as distance in time may give occasion for the future of probability.

A. J. BELL.

Victoria College, Toronto.

NOTES

SOPHOCLES, *OEDIPUS TYRANNUS*, l. 1219.

THE reading of the Laurentian MS. is

δύρομαι γὰρ ὡς περίαλλα
ἰαχέων ἐκ στομάτων

the objections to which are stated in Jebb's note. He himself reads

δύρομαι γὰρ ὥσπερ ἰάλεμον
χέων ἐκ στομάτων

He thinks that *ἰάλεμον χέων* being written *ἰαλεμὸ χέων* produced *ἰάλεμ ἄχέων* or *ἰαχέων*; 'the attempt to find an intelligible word in the immediately preceding group of letters would then quickly produce the familiar *περίαλλα*.'

But *ὥσπερ ἰάλεμον χέων* is a long way from *ὡς περίαλλα ἰαχέων*, and it is difficult to see how the corruption can have occurred.

The Laurentian MS. divides the line at *περίαλλα*, and any uncial MS. from which L. was copied would look something like this:

ΔΤΡΟΜΑΙΓΑΡΟΣΠΕΡΙΑΛΛΑ
ΙΑΧΕΟΝ etc.

May not Sophocles have written

ΔΤΡΟΜΑΙΓΑΡΟΣΠΕΡΙΑΜ
ΙΑΝΧΕΟΝ etc.?

The change of M to ΛΛ is easy, and the N of IAN (which Burges proposed) may have escaped a copyist's notice; or, later, in a minuscule MS., *ἰὰν χέων* may have been written *ἰὰ χέων*—the resultant in both cases being *ἰαχέων*. This explains the hiatus (*περίαλλα*) in L. A scribe, who knew the word *περίαλλα*, but nothing of scansion, finding *περίαλλ*, simply added the *a*, which again may have found its way from the margin into the text. This at least keeps nearer to the MSS. than Jebb's conjecture. As regards the sense—the chorus are giving an explanation of their perhaps unworthy lamentations. After all, it is Oedipus who feels the effect of his deed, not the chorus. The latter, by having just said

εἶθε σ' εἶθε σε
μήποτ' εἰσιδόμαν,

feel that they are showing ingratitude for the services rendered to Thebes by

Oedipus, in ridding them of the baneful Sphinx, and, therefore, now give a semi-apologetic explanation of their useless wailings:

δύρομαι γὰρ ὥσπερ ἴαμ'
ἰὰν χέων ἐκ στομάτων:

'For I lament pouring my voice from my lips as if it were a relief (comfort) (to me).' ὥσπερ . . . χέων is emphatic; i.e., 'I know my lament effects nothing; it cannot undo the past; but I derive some comfort and relief from my tears.' The chorus go on τὸ δ' ὀρθὸν εἰπεῖν ἀνέπνευσα τ' ἐκ σέθεν

καὶ κατεκόιμυσα τοῦμόν ὄμμα:

'and, to speak truth, thou both gavest me new life (i.e. by destroying the Sphinx) and (now) hast shed darkness over my eye (i.e. by the discovery of the sin).'

A close parallel to the use of ἴαμα is found in Aesch. Fr. 382: στεναγμοί, τῶν πόνων ἰάματα.

A. E. ROCHE.

ON THE DERIVATION OF 'FAMULUS,' 'FAMILIA.'

THE natural derivation of 'famulus,' perhaps because of its simplicity, appears to have passed unnoticed. Of the current explanations, that based on Festus, 'origo ab Oscis dependet apud quos servus famel nominatur,' merely shifts the ground from 'famulus' to 'famel,' and we get no further. Curtius

proposed to connect the Sanskrit 'dhâ,' Greek τίθημι, with the Oscan 'faama' (house)=Lat. 'domus,' and so 'famulus' would mean 'houseman.' Others try to force a connection with χαμαί, χθαμαλός, 'humilis,' so that 'famulus' would = 'humble man.' A third derivation is from FAC in 'facio,' and 'famulus' then is 'workman.' Isidore, who has an explanation for most words, contents himself with 'famulus, dicitur a propria servorum familia,' which is not very helpful.

It seems at least as probable as any of these attempts that 'famulus' is a diminutive from 'fames,' and originally meant 'a hungry man,' 'a starveling'; just as 'situlus,' the diminutive of 'sitis,' means 'a thirsty one,' 'a water pot.' The 'famulus,' we may suppose, was originally a broken man, who was glad to join another household and work for his food; whether he was worth his keep would depend partly upon his appetite. In the hierarchy of the household he would come after the 'dominus' and 'liberi' ('the master' and 'the free'), but before the 'servi' and the 'vernae' ('the saved captives' and the 'houseborn'), for theoretically he was not a slave. But to the master children, helpers, and slaves were alike hungry mouths to feed, and 'familia' ('the collection of starvelings') included all, even the invited friends, who sat round his table and consumed their measured portion—'mensa.'

F. A. WRIGHT.

Birkbeck College.

REVIEWS

DEMOSTHENES AND THE LAST DAYS OF GREEK FREEDOM.

Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom; 384-322 B.C. *Heroes of the Nations Series*. By A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE. 7½" × 5". Pp. 512. 26 illustrations; 2 plans and a map. Putnam's Sons.

IT was fitting that the lot of biographer of the great Athenian orator should fall to one whose notable rendering of the *Public Speeches* had already revealed his

insight into the character of their author.

This life of Demosthenes by Mr. Pickard-Cambridge at once takes its place alongside those of other 'classical' heroes in the same series—biographies whose reputation never stood in need of critical advocacy. These volumes, indeed, represent the better side of the movement to popularise the classics—an attempt which in works such as the

present is made consistent with the dignity of the subject and with sound scholarship. Throughout this volume the fact is never lost sight of that the subject has to be presented to an audience in whom a classical education cannot be assumed, and this difficult task is accomplished with an ease and naturalness which is never betrayed into mere patronising explanation. For the same reason, presumably, we are presented with no abstracted life of an individual, but we have revealed to us the whole stage upon which the drama of the great orator's life was enacted. For the purposes of the series this is undoubtedly an advantage, and though classical scholars will perhaps feel a certain impatience with what may appear excursions into rather remote regions, there can be no doubt that the work as a whole gains much in breadth and interest, while we can consent to tarry if by the way we gather such fruitful grains as, for instance, the brilliant character-sketch of Philip, the analysis of the policy of Eubulus, or the estimate of the political ideals of Isocrates. But classical scholars will find a series of exhaustive notes and appendices which, taken in conjunction with the text, make it a contribution to serious history.

As regards the subject-matter in general, Mr. Pickard-Cambridge's conclusions on the various difficult points that occur are always closely-reasoned and sometimes convincing, though perhaps in a 'popular' work we might have been spared a good deal of the processes of criticism and treated more simply to results. Nor in a *Heroes* series do we need to such an extent the excessive caution of critical scholarship. We think, in fact, that Mr. Pickard-Cambridge should have dealt less laboriously and more confidently with his material and relegated more to his appendices.

In particular, in the most interesting chapter on the Athenian democracy, it was surely an omission that what is frequently elsewhere implied is not here explicitly given as one of the causes contributing to the imperialistic 'hankerings' of the Athenian masses, viz., the fact that they expected those im-

perial aspirations to be realised at the expense of others. For when from neither the state revenues (which is not felt as a private expense), nor from the pockets of the rich, funds were forthcoming for mercenaries, etc., the Athenian citizens' imperial vision tended to become myopic.

Again—if we are to have such matters discussed—the close connection between the peace policy of the commercial magnates and the mercenary system is not brought out, though it is obvious that for a successful 'trade policy' and 'trade empire' you must have not only an army or armament, but an army or armament under the control of the interests concerned. Now the Athenian naval system—from the latter part of the Peloponnesian War till the great reforms of Demosthenes—always contained the germs of the possibility of sectional or 'party-interest' control, and all the evidence tends to the conclusion that this possibility was sedulously developed by the commercial interest in close connection and co-ordinately with the mercenary system. The natural distaste of the people for foreign service and the love of selfish idleness was no doubt deliberately encouraged by the wealthy classes, for whom, by such policy, freedom of control was secured. This is why the 'theoric' money was always brandished in public by Eubulus and his party before Demosthenes and the opposition. The relations, in fact, of Eubulus to the peace party finds some analogy, though a distant one, in the hopes, however vain and intermittent, which the 'equites' entertained with regard to Pompey.

Lastly, in the discussion of Philip's motives for the strikingly different treatment accorded by him to Thebes and to Athens, while admitting the force of the arguments adduced, are we to deny to Philip the diplomat the perception that the surest and easiest way to burst this the most unnatural of all alliances—that of Athens with Thebes—was the sowing between them of jealousy and suspicion? for favouritism from a 'benefactor' can demolish even sincere friendship—how much more so the 'friendship' of an Athens and a Thebes!

But these are minor points. With regard to the main theme of the book, the life and character of our hero, we are invited to regard a personality whose admitted 'unloveliness' is transfigured in his 'greatness' of soul, such greatness consisting in his burning and single-hearted devotion to the good of his country as that good was conceived by him.

But if, in the first place, greatness consists in knowing what one can not do as well as what one can, Demosthenes so far must forfeit any claim to greatness. For the conditions of the world of his day we can not hold him responsible, but for his failure to appreciate them we both can and should. But if to place supine acquiescence above resistance however hopeless, and to count a mute and inglorious fatalism 'greater' than valour in a lost cause is revolting, neither does Demosthenes display that sympathetic imagination which characterises the great man in his dealings with his fellows, nor yet that instinct to mould out of the living present a future organically developed from the past. Such a task requires not merely imitative ability but creative genius, and Demosthenes, in this respect, proved himself no greater, if no less, than his age, and in the judgment now before us this important fact is barely recognised.

But further, Demosthenes, immersed in the past and the present, lacked the genius to transcend either, and rarely rose superior to the out-worn artifices of 'friendships bought dearly and honour cheaply sold' and, in brief, of all the restless, shifty, petty, selfish and self-centred politics of Greece.

Finally, there is his lack of insight into and sympathy with the deeper feelings of the Athenian people; and this is the real cause of that insecurity of hold upon them, resulting in an intermittent political impotence which is only partly due to his wider political miscalculations: for, though we may pardon the presumption which ventured to believe the men of his day capable of the virtues and achievements of simpler and sterner days, what fatal blunder was that which dared to save Athens by a Theban alliance, to taint the purest

and deepest springs of national pride and loyalty with 'Persian gold,' while rejecting the humbler but more honourable rôle of an alliance with Philip against the barbarian? Truly, Demosthenes was too dull to be successfully mean and too mean to be triumphantly great. The cause lay in his personal character. The best biography of Demosthenes is his statue. There the defects of his public and private life—for they are analogous—lie revealed: passion without sympathy; intellect without humanity; a will arid because rootedly abstract; a fire ineffectual because overmasteringly fierce. It is no mere accident that Cicero has been likened to Demosthenes. Orators and lawyers both, fed on precedent and swollen with rhetoric, prone to assimilate rather than to understand, Demosthenes and Cicero, by reason of their fundamental non-comprehension of human nature, their egoism, their utter lack of humour, fabricated from the past a political chimaera having no relation to the possibilities of their political and social environment. Of this fetish enthroned they were the respective and self-ordained high-priests; its existence they identified, rightly, with their own; in its glory they felt their own weakness transfigured; its praises they sang with language matchlessly futile, and its cult they prosecuted with the pathos of vindictive fanaticism. By it and their own feelings about it they judged all things; and with it they perished miserably. Much, therefore, as we admire the author's able and courageous efforts to uphold his hero, the defence of Demosthenes, as a politician, we think, is a task as futile as the policy of Demosthenes himself.

For the rest, the book, with its discussion of democracy and imperialism; its allusions to the working in an ancient democracy of rhetoric—which, as we are reminded, has its modern counterpart in journalism; with its presentation of a free and humanly-civilised state confronted with a portentous and semi-barbarous but highly-organised and efficient military power of approved 'diplomatic skill' aiming at an universal tyranny, though well aware that while

freedom and democracy live its hold is insecure; and finally, with its portrayal of the slow and melancholy degeneration of the common weal into the control of lawyer minds, lawyer politicians and into lawyer pockets—all this gives the book a curiously modern ring and makes it extraordinarily interesting at the present time. Indeed, it is from illuminating works like these, if rightly used, that we can frame such a forecast—not necessarily a pessimistic one—of the evolution and

destiny of modern states as is based not on those differences between the ancient and the modern world which are so often and so mistakenly proclaimed as fundamental, but on their far more fundamental and therefore more potent spiritual identity.

The extracts from the speeches are well chosen, and the book, besides being most readable from cover to cover, is splendidly illustrated with photographs, reproductions of drawings, and maps.

O. H. T. RISCHBIETH.

HERODOTUS AND HIS WORK.

Herodotos: Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie. Vol. VIII., Supplement, 2tes Heft. By F. JACOBY. 1913.

THE article on Herodotus in the new edition of the great German Real-Encyclopädie has been eagerly anticipated by students of Greek history. Now that it has arrived, they certainly cannot complain that inadequate space has been allowed for the subject: 315 columns of 68 lines each would make a goodly enough volume, even though the lines are only about three-quarters the length of those in an ordinary octavo.

Whether it is a good plan to publish elaborate studies in an encyclopaedia might be a matter of question; it seems hard that the student of Herodotus should have to buy with Jacoby's article an equally long account of the various members of the Herod family. But usage has now sanctioned these elaborate articles.

A complaint may, however, be urged against the form in which the present article is presented. There is the scantiest bibliography—only half a column—at the end; all the other references are incorporated in the text. The student thus misses the advantage of a general conspectus of the literature; and, as all references after the first give only the name of the author and the page, the reader, if he overlook the first mention of the special treatise, has to search back to find out to what book subsequent references are made. And the custom

of putting all references in the text (instead of in footnotes) makes the articles in the new Pauly somewhat difficult reading; the parentheses are as long as they are frequent, and the brackets that enclose them are very inconspicuous.

But to turn to the contents of the article. Considering its length, it is disappointing to find how many aspects of Herodotus are not dealt with. There is not a line about his importance as an anthropologist, a subject on which the literature is abundant and rapidly increasing. Even more surprising, though less important, is the omission (pp. 262-3) of any indication how far Herodotus' account of Babylon has stood the test of the recent German excavations; this is all the more to be regretted as Jacoby's estimate of 'the travels' is on the whole excellent (p. 247 *seq.*), and Baumstark's article on 'Babylon' in Pauly, Vol. II., is of necessity largely out of date.

The widely held theory that Herodotus had been a merchant and had travelled in this capacity is dismissed with the remark (p. 248), 'Irgend welche Kaufmännische Züge zeigt H., dem das Rechnen stets Schwierigkeiten gemacht hat, nicht.' A little experience of the world would have shown Professor Jacoby that there have been many merchant kings who had as great difficulties with their addition sums as the Greek historian.

Again, the estimate of Herodotus' ob-

ligations to literary sources is treated in the most perfunctory manner. Three lines (p. 504) are all that are given to the *Persae* of Aeschylus, and two pages to all Herodotus' prose predecessors except Hecataeus. There are, however, frequent references to this writer and Herodotus' supposed obligations to him, and Professor Jacoby repeats (from Vol. VII.) at unnecessary length his own speculations on this subject.

Leaving this list of omissions, which could be indefinitely extended, let us turn to the abundant material which is given. It is refreshing to see Professor Jacoby's independence of judgment. Kirchhoff's famous hypothesis on the development of Herodotus' history is summarily dismissed as 'vielleicht das Ungeheuerlichste was philologische Pedanterie je zutage gefördert hat.' The same epithet (p. 490) is applied to Wecklein's comparison of the speeches of Herodotus and of Thucydides, which is 'einfach falsch.' 'Sicher irrtümlich' is E. Meyer's judgment on the sources of Hdt. Bk. VII. (It may be noted in passing that it is not fair to blame (p. 239), Meyer for 'explaining Herodotus' narrative of the past by the state of politics just at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.') The vigorous common-sense shown in such judgments as these is seen in many parts of Jacoby's article which are excellent—e.g., the section (§ 31) on Herodotus as a writer, where the remarks on the speeches, and on the place of the historian in the development of Greek prose, may be especially mentioned.

But it seems difficult to accept Professor Jacoby's account of the development of Herodotus' work. This theory comes over and over again in his article; it may fairly be said that a 'higher critic,' employing Professor Jacoby's own methods, would have no difficulty in showing that it had been written at very different times, and that in this way only could the repetitions be accounted for. Perhaps the best statement of the theory is in § 24 (pp. 352 f.). It may be briefly summarised as follows: Herodotus began as a traveller, intending to write, like Hecataeus, a *Γῆς περίοδος*; with this object he travelled in the period shortly before 445 B.C. Then

he came to Athens, where he fell under the personal influence of Pericles. He delivered 'lectures' on his travels, and on various parts of Greek History, in Athens and elsewhere. Athens and Pericles gave him a new point of view, and at the close of his life, just before the Peloponnesian War, he resolved to recombine his various *λόγοι* in one great work, which, describing the contest of Greeks and barbarians, would justify the Athenian Empire and show that it was at once well deserved and in the best interests of Greece. Jacoby does not think that Herodotus ever returned to Athens from Thurii; he maintains that death interrupted him in his work there, before he completed his history by bringing it down to the formation of the confederacy of Delos. 'That he did not recast his old lectures is shown by the frequent repetitions. . . . The distribution of the Greek *λόγοι*, so far as they concerned the history of the pre-Persian period, appears really to be merely mechanical ("Arbeit mit der Schere," p. 361).

It has long been accepted that Herodotus read publicly parts of his work. The new points in Jacoby's theory are the emphasis laid on his work as a lecturer, the assumption that his history in its present form is a recasting of old material, and the late date assigned for this recasting. The proof of the theory is a detailed analysis of the various parts of the work. It would be impossible to describe better than is done on p. 422 the complexity of Herodotean sources, but the Professor boldly essays the task.

One general criticism may first be made. The general effect of the Herodotean history will seem to most readers emphatically to contradict the 'lecture' theory. Whatever parts of it may be like, as a whole it reads quite differently from the *ἐπιδείξεις*, of which Greek audiences were so fond.

But this is a matter of impression. It may be worth while to examine in detail Jacoby's evidence for two of his points. The first is his analysis of the Lydian history; the second is his argument against the now widely held theory that the last three books were written first—a theory which, of course, is

fundamentally inconsistent with his own.

He maintains as to the Lydian history that three stages can be traced in its composition:

1. A Lydian *λόγος* which he composed before coming to Athens, in which he told what he knew of the history of Lydia and its natural features.

2. When he came to Greece and heard (at Delphi) much in connection with the Croesus offerings, he composed a special 'story of Croesus.'

3. When finally he began to write his present history, he put the story of Croesus first, because it suited his subject, 'the conflict of Greeks and barbarians.' But he combined with it a large section of Lydian history, and sandwiched in some large pieces of Lacedaemonian and of Athenian history, to form a connection; to make this connection he invented (p. 383) the alliance of Croesus with Lacedaemon, which is not a fact, but merely 'a literary motive.' (This last wild hypothesis he borrows from Wilamowitz.)

Now, what is the proof of all this? It may be briefly summarised as follows:

1. Herodotus begins his history with Croesus because he was 'the first barbarian we know to subdue Greeks'; but of his conquest there is only a brief account in c. 26; the intermediate chapters are occupied with the account of how Croesus' ancestor obtained the kingdom, and of the wars against the Greeks *before* Croesus. 'This contradiction admits of only one explanation: what we now read as the first part of the book was originally an independent story of Croesus.'

2. At the end of the Lydian history there are three separate conclusions, in cc. 91, 92, and 93-4.

It will be obvious to anyone that both these points are correct; Herodotus neither tells his story in the way we should expect at the beginning, nor does he quite know how to leave off. C. 92 has long been seen to be a fragment of evidence which Herodotus, for some reason, has failed to incorporate in his history. But these points only prove that Herodotus' idea of connection and the modern idea are different. Half a dozen other explanatory hypotheses as

probable as Jacoby's could be suggested; but neither they nor it can be proved.

With regard to the priority of Books VII.-IX., Jacoby's negative argument is largely *a priori*. 'It is impossible to understand the book if the historical basis (*Grundgedanke*) is the earlier' (p. 366). This will hardly convince those who see in this priority the natural order. He deals at length with the numerous arguments from details which Bauer, and after him Macan, have collected, to prove the hypothesis of early date. What he quite fails to appreciate is the cumulative effect of these; one by one they come to very little; combined they render the modern view quite probable. And Jacoby completely misunderstands Macan's strongest argument: that 'between the two groups of references (in Books VII.-IX.) there is a chronological interval of nearly thirty years. . . . The conclusion is clear. The last three books must have been composed not very long after' 457 B.C. (Macan, 1908. LIII.) Jacoby, in trying to answer this, at once proceeds to quote the reference to Pericles in Book VI., which has no bearing on the point at all, and makes the obvious remark: 'the references are to persons or events in the Persian War.' But Macan's point is the *absence* of references to events between 457 and 431, not the *presence* of references to events in the preceding period.

There is one important argument for the early date which Professor Jacoby deals with in a way that can hardly be condemned too severely. He accepts the well-known story of 'Plutarch,' quoting Diyllus, that Herodotus 'was honoured of the Athenian Senate when he read them his books,' but he rejects the form in which it comes in the chronologers—that the honour consisted of a grant of ten talents. So magnificent a sum would strongly confirm the early date of Books VI.-IX.; such a praise of Athens was well worth ten talents. But Professor Jacoby, like others before him, thinks the sum impossibly large. He is entitled to his view; but he is not entitled to quote Isocrates (*περί ἀντιδ.* 166) as saying that Pindar only received a 'thousand drachmas' for his dithyramb on Athens. Isocrates says

that Pindar received 'ten thousand drachmas' for 'a single phrase' (ἐν ῥήμα); all the texts give *μυπίας*; neither Bekker nor Blass (Teubner, 1879) gives any hint of a different reading, nor does the French edition of Cartelier. No doubt Professor Jacoby would say the reading was impossible. But he ought to tell his readers that he has altered the text, as he alters (quite unnecessarily) the texts of Diyllus (p. 57) as to Herodotus and Panyasis.

It must be added that his references

always need verifying; apart from the too numerous misprints, he often reads into a passage a meaning (as certain) which is neither probable nor even possible. It may be noted, as a compliment to Oxford scholarship, that he repeatedly quotes Dr. Macan's great edition (though he generally disagrees with him, as he does with most of his predecessors), and that he pronounces Hude's text in the *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* to be 'unenitbehrlich,' and gives his references to it.

THE SCHOOLS OF MEDIAEVAL ENGLAND.

The Schools of Mediaeval England. By A. F. LEACH. 1 vol. Demy 8vo. Pp. xvi + 350. 43 illustrations. London: Methuen, 1915. 7s. 6d. net.

MR. A. F. LEACH, after taking part as a practical teacher in the restoration of the ancient grammar school at Northallerton, is now by his writings pursuing a similar object over a wider field. His new book upon the Schools of Mediaeval England, is a vigorous challenge hurled against some of our dearest prepossessions. Comfortable ignorance upon this topic is blown out of its entrenchments. And in fact the wounds inflicted by Mr. Leach's artillery upon many captains of learning call for the services of the ambulance.

If I indicate some of the tactical points previously held by others, but now to all appearances in Mr. Leach's effective possession, the reader will gain some idea of the general lines of Mr. Leach's offensive. I am not certain that the author's attention ought not to be called to a possible ambiguity in the last word of the previous sentence. For although he has helped to clear up a large number of current errors, he has laid himself open to attack; there is at least one point upon which in my opinion he is open to further information. This I will try to indicate in the sequel with the respect which really is owing to a work of such value.

If it is true that the grammar schools of England have contributed to the formation of that character which we rightly and with pride are admiring upon

the battlefield, it is not a matter of indifference whether or not we can ascertain some of the causes which in the Middle Ages operated towards such a result. And Mr. Leach helps to clear the ground by excluding certain factors which have no right to the esteem in which in various quarters they unwarrantably enjoy. He deprives Edward VI. (in spite of Professor Pollard's protests) of the credit of founding the grammar schools which go by the King's name, and thus removes part of the artistic contrast between the darkness of pre-Edwardian times and the full glare kindled by the politicians who surrounded the young monarch's throne. But the illumination no longer referred to this quarter does not therefore in Mr. Leach's opinion stream from the mediaeval monasteries. These, indeed, he compares to voluntary workhouses and penitentiaries, and scouts the notion that the great monasteries were homes of learning as a delusion. Here we are concerned with the early Middle Ages (53). But, the same estimate of the monasteries affects the author's judgment throughout his book. Now, although he has made it sufficiently clear that the monasteries did not found the grammar schools, for all that they played a greater part in the transmission of ancient learning than Mr. Leach is willing to allow.

I should like to set in relief a statement which occurs in the even tenor of the narrative (p. 115). 'Though the cathedral and collegiate churches were the chief, they were not the only source of schools in the eleventh and early twelfth,

any more than in later, centuries. On the contrary, in every town of considerable population there was a demand for, and consequently a supply of, schools.' It is not yet recognised generally that the external splendour of the Middle Ages was paid for mainly by the towns in material and spiritual coin. And the cause of this our blindness is largely due to the attacks upon civic liberties which began under Henry VII. and matured under the two sons of Charles I. The degeneration in some respects of our mediaeval cities thus begun, proceeded more or less evenly through the eighteenth century, until the late Georgian era culminated with the discoveries of municipal jobbery and corruption by the commissioners of 1832. We look therefore through a fairly thick haze if we would see the mediaeval towns in their original light. It is difficult in face of the modern civic indifference to higher education to recreate the picture of an England with a grammar school to every six thousand inhabitants. 'The advancement of science and learning comes from a cultured middle class.' And this class arose with the towns. The Tudors and Stuarts plundered the towns and took away their privileges, and their courtiers adding insult to injury ridiculed the deficiencies of which they were the direct causes. Curiously enough, Dickens in his descriptions of Eatanswill and Ipswich in the *Pickwick Papers* maintains the literary attitude towards this decadence. Unfortunately the new centres of population in England have measured themselves by the faint shadows of civic splendour which still haunt their ancient seats, and the English nineteenth century goes down to posterity as the mother of mean streets, of mean churches, of mean towns. May I suggest to Mr. Leach that he should put the grammar schools of which he has recovered the history more into their proper context, so that Shakspeare will mark for us the sunset of English town life at its best?

I do not find sufficient reference to the education of boys (girls apparently did not exist) considered along with the intellectual and social movements of which the towns were the centre. But

this fascinating topic lies perhaps outside of the author's plan and it is ungrateful to complain when he has given us so much. At any rate, if the cathedrals and other churches served by the secular clergy provided the schools, the townspeople eagerly availed themselves of the opportunities of learning thus provided. And this fact enables us to put another topic of Mr. Leach's in its right place—I mean humanism. Mankind is usually so busy with the general purposes of life that there is little room left for liberal studies and the fine arts. The monastic orders recognising this fact shut themselves up and tried to create an artificial environment in which their own particular point of view should find satisfaction. But this satisfaction cannot be found apart from the common life. And the common life is presented once for all in the Latin classics; for these make the same appeal as Greek literature to human possibilities, an appeal less profound indeed but for that very reason more within the usual scope. Chaucer and Shakspeare, therefore, learned from the town as well as the grammar school to interpret life in a language more universal than ecclesiastical Latin.

In these strenuous times Mr. Leach seems to associate patriotism with our traditional English mispronunciation of Latin. And here it is lamentable to a grateful reader that one should have to find serious fault. It is inaccurate in the extreme to speak of the modern unreformed pronunciation of Latin as current in the time of Aelfric (p. 87). 'Even as late as 1542,' Sir John Sandys¹ assures us, 'the vowels were still pronounced at Cambridge in the Italian manner. But the Reformation made it no longer necessary for the clergy to use the common language of the Roman Church; and partly to save trouble to teachers and learners Latin was gradually mispronounced as English.' I have transplanted this valuable section into my own commentary, because Sir John Sandys has only revealed a fraction of the truth. What was the other fraction of the purpose with which Latin was mispronounced? There is evi-

¹ *History of Classical Scholarship*, II. 233.

dence upon which, after long search, I cannot again put my hand that the Westminster boys (who were to take the lead of English schools in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) were specially instructed in the mispronunciation of Latin, in order that they might neither understand nor take part in the Roman service. I believe that the present distinguished headmaster still maintains this tradition. But patriotism of this subtle kind was not confined to Westminster. Lichfield Grammar School trained Dr. Johnson, and this sound Englishman, when he was presented to a Frenchman of great distinction, would not 'deign to speak French, but talked Latin, though his Excellency did not understand it, owing perhaps to Johnson's English pronunciation.' Mr. Leach may well be confident relying upon such predecessors, but I cannot congratulate him upon his contribution to the subject (p. 88). When boys 'patter their pater,' it is probable according to my colleague Professor Weekley, in his *Romance of Words*,¹ that 'patter is for paternoster,' so that the very weapon

used by the author to rout the innovators proves their prescriptive right to the field in question. In fact, our English vowel scale closely resembled the Italian down to the middle of the sixteenth century. On this whole matter of Latin pronunciation Mr. Leach is deplorably mistaken.

But we must not allow this fault to blind us to the great services which he has done to English education by publishing this history. He has laid the foundation for many profitable enquiries which can be pursued in living contact with facts. The thoughtful person is no longer tempted in this field at least to imitate his professed model and lift himself up above the ground in the philosophical basket in order to walk in air and contemplate the sun's brilliance. Mr. Leach has lit some street lamps in the mediaeval night, and we may yet construct a serviceable map of the place. To conclude on a note of agreement, Latin instruction in the towns of England shared in their general intense life, and was therefore by the oral method.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

THE *ACHARNIANS* OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Acharnians of Aristophanes. Edited from the MSS. and other original sources by RICHARD THOMAS ELLIOTT, M.A. 8vo. Pp. xliii+241. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 14s. net.

WHEN Mr. Elliott announced, seven years ago, that he had completed full collations of all the MSS. of the *Acharnians*, that play was still suffering from the want of a good English edition. Since then we have been given full-dress editions by Mr. Starkie and Mr. Rogers, and a useful commentary by Mr. Rennie, and in 1907 Mr. Cary had already published, in *Harvard Studies*, a careful examination of the MSS. of this play which to some considerable extent anticipates the purpose of Mr. Elliott's volume. To sum up the contents of this edition, it contains a brief résumé of the author's conclusions as to the MSS., a text with

testimonia and extremely full apparatus, a series of notes, mainly textual, at the end, and three appendices.

With regard to the MSS., Mr. Elliott's conclusions agree in all but slight detail with those of Mr. Cary, and the relations of the fourteen MSS. may now be regarded as settled, at any rate so far as concerns the *Acharnians*. The evidence on which Mr. Cary relied Mr. Elliott has checked, corrected here and there, amplified by references to *lemmata* and citations, and placed before us *in extenso*.² It is as a full statement of the facts that this text is chiefly valuable, for the immediate profit to the text of the *Acharnians* is, it must be said, small. Mr. Elliott's apparatus

² His apparatus includes full collations for considerable portions of the play even of Δ, V61, M9, E2, which are direct copies of extant MSS.

shows indeed that the MSS. of Aristophanes have in the past been collated with a carelessness which I can only hope is unusual, but the actual damage to the text has been slight. We shall read, for example, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ for $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ at 73 on a better report of R, but at the *crucis* we shall continue to read what we will for all the help the new collations give us.

Mr. Elliott's own text is extremely conservative, and his additional notes are full of criticism of metrical and grammatical canons which have served as a basis for emendation. Much of this criticism is in detail sensible and just (though I think Prof. J. W. White's full statement of the evidence makes some of the metrical polemic unnecessary); the tone in which it is couched, however, seems to me unfortunate. Mr. Elliott is not himself consistent, for at 590 he yields to Dawes and reads $\tau\epsilon\theta\nu\acute{\eta}\xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, and at 611 alters $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota\gamma\epsilon$ in deference to Porson, but as a general rule he is extremely contemptuous of such 'unproved hypotheses.' And at 924, where he reads $\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$ with Bothe, I cannot but suspect that the decisive merit of this emendation is that it has been called un-Attic. 'The mere fact that the simple form is not found elsewhere in the scanty remains of classical literature, except in a very doubtful passage of Euripides (*I.A.* 1581),' says Mr. Elliott, quoting Mr. Rogers, 'is absolutely unimportant when we consider the frequent occurrence not only of $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$, but also of $\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\acute{\alpha}\phi\nu\omega$; and he has not paused to consider that he is arguing against, not for, $\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$. If $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$ and $\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$ are identical in sense, and $\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$ never occurs, then my reluctance to introduce it will increase in exact proportion to the frequency with which I meet $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\acute{\iota}\phi\nu\eta\varsigma$. 'I doubt the logic,' says Mr. Elliott (*à propos* on this occasion of Cobet's $\xi\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\epsilon\theta'$ at 101), 'of forming a theory and then assuming that part of the evidence must be spurious if it does not support the theory.' It may not be logical, but it is the way such theories as Porson's cretic law come into an existence which few would deny to be justified. Where MSS. are your chief or only evidence for metrical and grammatical forms, the path of criticism

necessarily includes circles of this kind, and critics will sometimes tread on their own tails. Good critics will do so less frequently than bad, because they tread more delicately, but the risk can be wholly avoided only by an inglorious determination to stand still.

Of his own emendations Mr. Elliott prints seven in the text; and here, I think, he has been too partial, for, with the exception of $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\acute{\rho}\iota$ at 731 (already proposed on other grounds by Mr. Starkie), I do not much expect to see any of them in that proud position again.¹ As a rule, however, he is extremely shy of conjectures, and maintains, truly enough, that Aristophanes has been the subject of much indiscreet alteration. Indiscretion, however, is possible in defence as well as attack, and I do not think (for example) that Lamachus's blow on the head can be usefully employed to explain the nonsense he is made to talk at 1185. Still, as a rule, Mr. Elliott's defences, though they often leave me unconvinced, are sensible and relevant. On the other hand, his edition would be much more useful to students of the *Acharnians* if he had added an appendix of conjectures after the fashion of Wecklein's *Aeschylus*. For just as he often defends the text where it has been attacked, so he is often silent as to the attack where he thinks no defence is needed. Ἐλθόντες , for example, at 25, might be the object of universal admiration for all we are here told to the contrary.

Of the three appendices, the second, which contains a transcript of the papyrus fragments of the play, calls for no comment. The first is an elaborate investigation of Athenaeus's text of Aristophanes, from which it appears that his tradition does not coincide with any branch of ours, and that where our MSS. differ he is usually (like Suidas) on the side of the angels. Mr. Elliott seems to me, however, to exaggerate the importance of Athenaeus's evidence for the text. Athenaeus has preserved a good many words in lines quoted expressly for the word (e.g. $\kappa\omicron\tau\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\iota\omicron\nu$

¹ At 611 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\iota\gamma\epsilon$ is conceivably right; but Elmsley's $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\gamma\epsilon$ and Blaydes's $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\gamma\epsilon$ leave little to Mr. Elliott, and even to that little Mr. Starkie has a prior claim.

at *Ach.* 459), but apart from such express citation the only plausible reading due to him alone seems to be *θερμόν* at *Vesp.* 330,¹ and the list of his agreements in good readings with one or other group of MSS. presents no very imposing testimony to his integrity. It is noticeable that the emendations which Mr. Elliott tries and condemns by the evidence of what he calls the 'undesigned coincidence' of Athenaeus and the MSS. are almost without exception unacceptable on other grounds. Still, if I wished to read with Bentley *ἱπρος* at *Plut.* 815, I should not be much deterred by Athenaeus's disapproval. Mr. Elliott himself is a little inconsistent, for at 475 he prints an emendation which ignores Suidas's express testimony to the word *φιλτάτιον*, though elsewhere he attaches great importance even to such late evidence, and is sufficiently patient of eccentric forms to defend *ἐντετευτλανωμένης* at 894.

The third appendix, which contains an investigation of the dialect scenes in Aristophanes, is in some ways the most valuable part of the book, though the results show that editors may well despair. Aristophanes is inconsistent (*Ach.* 746 is the most striking example) and, judged by inscriptional evidence, inaccurate, and of course his scribes Atticise. So when, to take a simple instance, Megarian inscriptions have

both *εἰ* and *αἰ*, Aristophanes consistently *αἰ*, but at 742 *εἶπερ*, the choice between *εἶπερ* and Elmsley's *αἶπερ* can hardly be decided by reason.² But, at any rate, this appendix contains a full and impartial digest of all the materials, and will be indispensable to all students of the dialect plays.

As I have in this notice criticised mainly certain judgments of Mr. Elliott, it is only fair to say that the importance of the book lies not in his judgments, but in the store of facts he has collected. Scholars will not, I think, always agree with Mr. Elliott, but they will not be the less grateful on that account for the years of patient and laborious work which have obviously gone to the making of his edition. The immediate results seem to me, and I think must have seemed to Mr. Elliott, disappointing, but the information here gathered together will in various ways be of value to students of this and other plays, and when the problem of the Aristophanic MSS. is finally solved Mr. Elliott will not be without his share in the credit.

A. S. F. Gow.

² The question is in certain cases complicated by a doubt as to how Aristophanes represented the sounds; but speculation on this head does not seem very profitable in the present state of our knowledge. On p. 163 Mr. Elliott says Aristophanes' autograph 'would probably have been in the Ionic alphabet'; on the next page he seems to imply that it was in the Attic.

¹ *Nais* at *Plut.* 179 is an emendation.

GREEK AND ROMAN SACRIFICE.

Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer. By VON S. EITREM. Pp. 493. Kristiania: Utgit för H. A. Bennechts Fond, bei Jacob Dybwad.

THE main argument of this book suggests that the normal preliminaries of Greek and Roman sacrifice are the 'fossilised' survival of a ritual older than the gods, and older than the sacrifice of animals to the gods; that this ritual is itself, in origin, a sacrifice, not, as Stengel thought, to Gaia, but to the dead. The author examines each detail of the preliminary rite, and shows how each has its place in the ancient

cult of the dead. That cult passed into the cult of heroes, and of chthonic powers, and finally of Olympian gods: traces of it survive in the Olympian ritual as in magic and mystery.

To this general argument, I suppose, few scholars will object. But I imagine that the methodical and rather pedestrian treatment, though to the present reviewer it gives confidence, will seem, to learned and imaginative followers of Dieterich and other hierophants of protobarbaranthropology, to omit all that really matters. In defence of Eitrem's method it may be said that we know,

without question, that the worship of the dead played an important part in the primitive religion of Greece, whereas the evidence for the 'Eniautos-Daimon,' for Kouros-worship, and even for Dieterich's universal Gaia-cult, at any rate in Greece, is, at least, inadequate. Eitrem explains too much by reference to the cult of the dead. He seems to imply that there was a time when that particular department of superstition alone mattered. Is it not more probable that, from the earliest times, life was made complicated, not only by the dead, but also by all manner of magical powers and dangers? Still, the worship of the dead played so important a part in the development of religion that I prefer the exclusiveness of Eitrem to the vague, if stimulating, lavishness of *Themis*. The advantages of Eitrem's method may be illustrated by his insistence that the pouring of water must be explained on the same lines as similar ritual use of milk, blood, honey, etc. (p. 100), so that we must not talk, with Jevons, of the 'water-spirit'; by his rejection of Usener's suggestion that honey is given to the 'blessed' dead because honey is the food of the gods (p. 107), and by his admission that water is used by the dead for washing as well as for drinking (p. 118), however much the Theosaurus may incline to Loewe's gratuitous conjecture *aqua quae mortuis libatur per qua mortuis lavatur*. Turn to his treatment of the *καταχύσματα* (e.g. p. 266) and the kindred throwing of stones (p. 284), and I think you will feel more comfortable than you generally feel when you read of such strange matters. And, in general, the use of literary evidence—though the distinction between early and late, Greek and barbarian, might be more clearly indicated—is more sober, and therefore more suggestive, than, for example, that of a recent writer on the origin of Comedy. It is unlikely, I think, that Xenophon, when he laid aside his garland on the receipt of bad news, did so because death 'breaks the protective power of garland as of ring,' and not rather because he felt that garlands were unsuitable for a moment of sorrow (p. 69). It is perverse to

suggest that *ἀνηφαίστω πυρί* in Eur. *Or.* 614, has anything to do with the superstition that it is a bad omen if sacrifices refuse to burn (p. 137). The fact that Demos is boiled to youth by the sausage-seller is *not*, though the myth of Medea *is*, evidence for the superstition that hot-water has magical powers (p. 191). Still, slips like these are exceptional, and there is nothing here which approaches the fantastic imagination of those who will not allow Medea to outwit Jason or recoil from her crime without the excuse of an original ritual *Agon*,¹ and who forbid Demos to be cooked, Philocleon to faint, victors to be crowned, or Aristophanic characters to throw stones or behave obscenely, unless they have the excuse that the poet had to follow the outlines of an 'original sacred drama,' with human sacrifice, and a ritual contest, and *ἱερὸς γάμος* as well.² From this kind of fancy Eitrem's sober method is a welcome relief. In the difficult matter of the interpretation of vase-paintings (e.g. p. 10 and p. 168) he is not always cautious.

A book of this kind, made up of a great mass of evidence, naturally contains many suggestions which interest a student of literature. I will mention a few:—*ἀμφίπολον* Pind. *Ol.* I. 93 is applied to the tomb of Pelops because the worshipper *went round it* ceremonially, not, as the scholiast says, to admire (p. 10); Eur. *El.* 803, the queen prepares the barley, as the wife probably did in the ancient family worship (p. 294); *Eum.* 371, the dances of the Furies are *ἐπίφθονοι* because they move from right to left to bind the victim (p. 45); Suet. *Vitell.* 2, *capite velato circumvertensque se, deinde procumbens*, a combination of the old Roman act of worship with the oriental *προσκύνησις* (p. 48); Soph. *O. C.* 489, whispering, so that only the ghosts can hear (p. 124); *Od.* iv. 759, not a truncated sacrifice, but a complete, old-fashioned rite, prayer with offering of grain (p. 277); Ar. *Pax* 1,074, an excellent jest, as van Leuwen shows,

¹ See Professor Murray in *Themis*, p. 354. The argument is characteristic.

² See Mr. Cornford's *Origin of Attic Comedy*.

because salt is used medicinally for madness (p. 325).

It would have made the task of reading and of reviewing easier if the author had always provided as clear a summary of his conclusions as that with

which he has ended his illuminating account of magic circles and garlands and rings.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

THE *ALCESTIS* OF EURIPIDES.

The Alcestis of Euripides, translated into English Rhyming Verse, with Explanatory Notes, by Professor GILBERT MURRAY. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1s. net; cloth, 2s. net.

IN this new rendering of the *Alcestis* Professor Gilbert Murray has given us a fresh example of his admirable method of translation. When he sits down to translate Greek tragedy he does not ask himself, 'Is this in the tragic style?' but, 'Will this convey to an English audience what Euripides meant to convey to the Athenians?' In the *Bacchae*, by using modern religious phraseology, he tries to make us realise something of the religious feeling of the Greeks; so here, wishing to make us see how Euripides presented the grief of a child at the loss of its mother, he gives us—

Mummy has gone away
And left me and will not come back any more.

* * * * *

Such a little time we had her. She might
have stayed
On till we all were old. . . .
Everything is spoiled when Mother is dead.

Some critics will object that this is not the language of poetry. But then that is what they said about Wordsworth.

The choruses hardly afford the translator the same opportunity for lyric verse as the choruses of the *Bacchae*; but some of the charm of

'Will they ever come to me, ever again?'

of the *Bacchae* is to be found in the following stanzas:

Chorus.

Oh, a House that loves the stranger,
And a House for ever free!
And Apollo, the Song-changer,
Was a herdsman in thy fee;

Yea, a-piping he was found
Where the upward valleys wound,
To the kine from out the manger
And the sheep from off the lea,
And love was upon Othrys at the sound.

And from deep glens unbeholden
Of the forest to his song
There came lynxes streaky-golden,
There came lions in a throng,
Tawny-coated, ruddy-eyed,
To that piper in his pride;
And shy fawns he would embolden
Dappled dancers, out along
The shadow by the pine-tree's side.

In the longer speeches there is much fine writing, and all the dignity with which Admetus can be invested is expressed in the stately lines beginning:

I called not thee to burial of my dead.

In the Preface is much fresh suggestion, even in regard to this much-commented-on Play. But then, as Professor Murray says of Dr. Verrall, his 'work, as always, stands apart. Even if wrong, it has its own excellence.' He devotes some space to maintaining that Alcestis is 'not by any means a mere blameless ideal heroine. . . . Where he (Admetus) is passionate and romantic, she is simple and homely. . . . When Admetus has made a thrilling answer about eternal sorrow, and the silencing of lyre and lute, and the statue who shall be his only bride, Alcestis earnestly calls the attention of witnesses to the fact that he has sworn not to marry again.' Is not Professor Murray from the Greek point of view a little 'wrong' here? Surely her simplicity and homeliness are just what the average Greek husband held to be 'ideal' in a wife? This inability on our part to realise the shifting nature of some ideals, though not of all, very much exaggerates the difficulty critics have raised over Admetus' treatment of Heracles. Hos-

pitality is largely a question of geography; and as a virtue, even nowadays, ranks quite differently in Shetland and in South Kensington. Professor Murray's treatment of this incident in the Notes is excellent.

Of Thanatos, as presented by Euripides, Professor Murray writes with wonderful insight. We have become accustomed to think of Death and Sin as they existed in the Puritan imagination, solemn, majestic figures. Professor Murray writes: 'Thanatos is not a god, not at all a King of Terrors. One may compare him with the dancing skeleton

who is called Death in mediaeval writings.' And immediately there rises before us the mocking skeleton of the Dance of Death, and we realise that for once the mediaeval conception is nearer to the Greek than our own. The Notes contain much that is stimulating, and we go about our daily occupations, and cannot get the play out of our minds. The *Alcestis*, as another poet-translator wrote of it,

Ends nowise to my mind
In pardon of Admetos.

M. P.

THE CLARENDON PRESS TEXT OF LIVY.

Titi Livi Ab Vrbe Condita recognoverunt et adnotatione critica instruxerunt R. S. CONWAY et C. F. WALTERS, Tom. i., Libri i.-v. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo. Pp. xl+485. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1914. 4s. cloth; 3s. 6d. paper; 5s. 6d. India paper.

TWENTY or twenty-five years ago the opinion was widely held that any progress in the textual criticism of Latin classical authors lay only in the direction of emendation by trained scholars. It was assumed that all the manuscripts, or at least all the important manuscripts, were known and exactly collated, that the readings of all the important printed editions had been gathered together, and that all the emendations made by earlier scholars were accessible in some up-to-date apparatus criticus. The intervening years have brought a rude awakening, and have shown that in none of these particulars were the trusted editions really satisfactory. A more exhaustive examination of catalogues, in preference to editors' prefaces, a careful comparison of early printed editions, and a more thorough scrutiny of *adversaria* printed and unprinted, revealed that much progress was still possible in the preparation of the necessary basis for the emender's operations. It is enough to instance the conspicuous work of Mr. A. C. Clark on Cicero, Mr. C. Hosius and others on Lucan, and Mr. A. E.

Housman on Juvenal; and, as such discoveries have been due in particular to British scholarship, it is an especial pleasure to welcome another conspicuous illustration of the statement in the eagerly-awaited first volume of Livy by Professor R. S. Conway.

In the first place Professor Conway has utilised a number of manuscripts hitherto unknown or neglected, in particular one at Oxford and another at the British Museum. The Oxford MS. belongs to the eleventh century, was written in France, and was in the possession of the Jesuit Collège de Clermont at Paris till the middle of the eighteenth century, when, at the dispersal of that collection, it was bought, with many others, by the Dutch collector Meerman. At the sale of his books at the Hague in 1824 it was purchased, along with the ancient MS. of Jerome's Chronicle and other MSS., by Professor Gaisford for the Bodleian Library. The British Museum Harley MS. dates from the thirteenth or fourteenth century, and came from Agen in the south of France. Dr. Conway, in the second place, has revised the reports of scholars like Alschefski and Frigell on other MSS. For example, the celebrated Medicean MS. itself has demanded an exact scrutiny in many passages, particularly where erasure has occurred. Many other errors, too, have received decent interment at his hands. We are, further, deeply indebted to him for the

knowledge that we now possess of the manuscripts at Bamberg,¹ Einsiedeln and Florence (Dominican).

It was no light task and no trifling service to have collected all this valuable material, but the arrangement of the readings of ten manuscripts in an apparatus was a still more exacting piece of work. In view of the *lacunae* in the manuscripts, Professor Conway has thought it advisable to name the manuscript authorities individually for each reading given in the apparatus. Perhaps it would have been a better plan if he had indicated in the margin of the apparatus, after the fashion of the Vienna editions of the Latin Fathers, what manuscripts were lacking at particular points. Then the apparatus could have been restricted to the mention of rejected variants, and the student would have more readily grasped the relationship of one MS. to another.

The result of all this labour and thought is of course absolutely to antiquate every preceding edition. They are all at best pieces of patchwork of varying quality, while this is the result of true and thorough scientific method. I will not occupy the brief space at my disposal by considering the text of particular passages, but will merely allude to the matter of orthography, because the treatment of this shows perhaps best of all the thoroughness of the editor's work (cf. I. 12 § 1 n, III. 47 § 7 n). When the last volume is published, it ought to be provided with an 'index orthographicus.' I have read every word of the apparatus in the endeavour to fix the palaeographical

character of the various archetypes behind our surviving MSS. One fact alone has emerged with absolute certainty, and that is that 'insular' copies lie behind many of our MSS. In I. 24 § 7 *tú* is an accented *tu*, such accented monosyllables as *o* being a feature of insular MSS. adopted occasionally by others; in I. 39 § 1 *đ* is probably rather *deest*; in I. 41 § 1 *eiðcit* (cf. praef. p. xxxiv) is treated with too great respect, being merely a very frequent Merovingian spelling which has descended to later MSS.; in I. 44 § 3 *it* may very well be *item*; in I. 50 § 7 *factnerosus*, as the better spelling, should have been read (cf. II. 1 § 5 *pignera*); in II. 17 § 4 the corruption of all MSS. is probably due to an original in the 'Corbie' script (cf. 20 § 9); in II. 53 § 6 the explanation of the reading *perpeti* does not seem to me palaeographically possible; in III. 51 § 7 the scribe of *F* certainly meant *quieuit*, to which parallels are not infrequent; in III. 59 § 3 *uetera* must first have been corrupted to *uīra* (cf. Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 225). In the preface, p. vii, n. 3, l. 2, for 'codicum' read 'codices' (so. p. ix, l. 3 from foot, p. xxxv, l. 17); p. xii, l. 9, 'Vrbi' for 'Vrbis'; § 12, the autograph of Rhenanus is possibly still preserved in his library at Schlettstadt; p. xxii, l. 4, read 'Claramontano'; p. xxv, at the top, the errors seem explicable without resort to the theory of dictation, which Madvig was doubtless too hasty in excluding absolutely; p. xxxii, l. 3, and elsewhere, read rather *Aginnensis* or *Agennensis* (see the *Thesaurus* s. v.): in the apparatus at V. 7 § 7 read *finitus*, and at V. 18 § 1 for *Stadtr.* read *Staatsr.*

A. SOUTER.

University, Aberdeen.

¹ Collated by the lamented A. H. Kyd, of Wadham College and Manchester University, who would have rendered yet greater services to scholarship if he had lived.

SHORT NOTICES

The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army. By G. L. CHEESMAN. 8vo. Pp. 192. 1 plate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 5s. net.

I MUST begin this notice with the confession that I read most of Mr. Chees-

man's volume in proof and that he has made friendly allusion to me in his preface. Nevertheless I do not think that I shall be suspected of log-rolling if I praise what everyone will recognise as a most excellent and also as a most useful book. Its merits are indeed

many. It is a comprehensive review of one half of the Roman army, which is alike up-to-date, complete, brief, and lucid, and is written with sound historical insight. The auxilia are important to all classical students. They are repeatedly mentioned in ancient literature; no one can read much of any Roman historical writer—Caesar, Tacitus, or anyone else—without encountering many references to Roman auxiliary regiments and needing to understand them if he is properly to appreciate his text. Yet no good and full account of the auxilia exists in English. Mr. Stuart-Jones, in his *Companion to Roman History*, gives indeed a capital chapter on 'War,' but he does not deal with the matter of Mr. Cheesman's book. Even the two admirable monographs on the Roman *Alae* and *Cohortes* (which made up the chief auxilia) which Cichorius contributed to the first and fourth volumes of *Pauly-Wissowa* are more of an army list than an account of the principles and growth—as well as the details—of the Roman Auxilia, and one of the articles is now twenty and the other fifteen years old. Few books fill a real gap so really well as Mr. Cheesman's volume. Moreover, in modest and incidental fashion, he introduces much new matter, so that he not only codifies but carries forward our knowledge of the Roman army. It is not very easy to indicate these advances in detail without occupying more space than might seem justifiable. But every reader of the book will notice that the author has formed his own opinion, alike on many details and on various general matters treated by previous writers, and that while (as he states in his preface) he has found little cause to leave the path indicated by Mommsen thirty years ago, he has followed it with independence and judgment and has attained good original results. I may cite one instance of somewhat general interest, the good or evil of the 'celibacy' of the Roman soldier (pp. 118 ff.). Seeck's arguments on this matter, first set out in the *Rheinisches Museum* and since summarised in his *Untergang*, are not only refuted, but there emerges a truer statement than I have seen elsewhere of the actual position in the Roman army.

Again, the army lists, if one may so call them, in the two appendices, contain a fuller conspectus of the Auxilia in respect of distribution and composition than any scholar has yet put together, and the concluding note on the *cohortes voluntariorum* adds to its value. If, as Mr. Cheesman says, Mommsen laid very well the foundations of our knowledge of the Roman Imperial army, if progress does not here lie through the bouleversement of received opinions, there was still room for advance and this book has filled a good deal of it.

Let me add that the volume may well interest a wider circle than professed scholars or historians. It is written by one who has long known of military things, and it is plain that as he wrote his book the conditions and problems of modern armies were always in his mind.

[NOTE.—This review was written some time ago, before Mr. Cheesman went out to fight and die. I have left it as it was. For the rest, see p. 222.]

F. HAVERFIELD.

Aus Platos Werdezeit. By MAX POHLENZ. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 427. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 10.

HERR POHLENZ has given us an interesting study of the intellectual development of Plato in his earlier years. The treatise is based throughout on a painstaking investigation of the dialogues, and bears evidence of wide reading in connection with the subject.

An examination of the purely Socratic dialogues brings Herr Pohlenz to the conclusion that none of them can have been written before the death of Socrates, seeing that the *Apology*, *Laches*, and *Charmides* were evidently meant to be a justification of his character and methods, while the *Hippias Minor* must, by reason of many allusions, be subsequent to these three dialogues, and the *Protagoras* similarly presupposes the existence of the *Hippias Minor*.

These Socratic dialogues give only hints of a positive answer to the question, 'What is Virtue?'—but in the *Gorgias* and the *Meno* Herr Pohlenz sees a deliberate grappling with the problem

of conduct and the dawning of a conviction that knowledge of the Good is possible through an *à priori* comprehension of the Ideas. In the *Gorgias*, and especially in the *Republic*, the conclusion is reached that political virtue can be practised by citizens only when the statesman regulates their lives in accordance with the Idea of Good.

In his later chapters the author analyses the *Menexenus* (which he regards as certainly authentic), the *Phaedo*, the *Phaedrus*, the *Lysis*, and the *Symposium*. In the *Phaedo* the Theory of Ideas, which was introduced in the *Meno* in order to explain the possibility of knowledge, finds further support as a necessary complement to the doctrine of Immortality. The *Phaedrus*, *Lysis*, and *Symposium* show that reminiscence of the Ideas depends upon Eros, upon a divine *μανία*, that begins with admiration of sensible beauty, but finally rouses the soul to a desire of contemplating the Good. Eros is the mediator between the Sensible and the Ideal.

To turn to some minor points, Herr Pohlenz throws out the interesting suggestion that the introductory narrative (Ich-Erzählung), in dialogues like the *Parmenides* and the *Symposium*, which has hitherto been regarded as chiefly an artistic device to supply the reader with a proper temporal perspective, may have served as a form of dedication. In these dialogues Plato brings into special prominence the personality of the narrator, who is thereby offered a friendly compliment similar to that rendered in more modern times by a formal dedication. As regards the question of the historical verisimilitude of the Platonic Socrates—a thesis upheld by Ivo Bruns, and more recently by Professor Burnet—we find in this volume a well-reasoned argument in favour of the more orthodox view, that the Socratic discussions represent Plato's own mental questionings rather than the sentiments of the real Socrates.

Herr Pohlenz, following the tradition of Aulus Gellius and the work of Usener and Rohde, considers that the present form of the *Republic* is a second edition, and that the political discussion, recapitulated at the beginning of the *Timaeus*, refers to an earlier and less metaphysical treatise. The difficulty of

making Plato allude to an earlier rather than a later version of the *Republic*, is overcome by the supposition that after his second Sicilian journey he found it useful to fall back on his first practical version as the first member of a tetralogy comprising the *Republic*, *Timaeus*, *Critias* and *Hermocrates*. There is no inherent objection to this supposition, but the introductory dialogue of the *Timaeus* might quite conceivably be a summary of our present *Republic*, modified for the purposes of the dialogue.

Apart from points like this, there is little in the volume that is likely to raise much controversy. The author has given a very satisfactory sketch of the early development of Platonic theory.

MARIE V. WILLIAMS.

Huguenot College, Wellington, Cape Colony.

ON ISIDORE, VIII. xi. § 83.

REFERRING to Sir J. E. Sandys' note on pp. 139, 140 of vol. xxix. of this *Review*, as to the words 'villosus est (sc. Pan), quia tellus convestita est agitentibus,' I suggest that 'agitventibus' is a corruption of 'leguminibus' (i.e. 'leguminous plants'). *u = ii*, *m = ue*, *in = nt*; and, if the upstroke of *l* had been merged in the downstroke of a letter above it, *le* might have looked like *a* (open).

SAMUEL ALLEN.

NEW EDITION OF BURY'S GREECE.

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY. Second edition. Pp. 909. 1913. 8s. 6d.

FOR the new edition Professor Bury has re-written the greater part of Chapter I. The researches of Professor Ridgeway and Dr. Leaf and the discoveries of Sir Arthur Evans and others in Crete have rendered this necessary, and have further led him to abandon the belief that previous to the Achæan invasion Greece was inhabited by a non-Greek population. He now thinks it probable that in the third millennium B.C. Greek-speaking peoples

were gradually spreading themselves through the Peloponnesus, and that the coming of the Achaeans may 'be compared, not to the Anglo-Saxon occupation of Britain, but rather to the

Norman Conquest.' A few other minor changes have been made; the accounts of the battles of Salamis and Plataea have been partly re-written. Σ.

OBITUARIES

ALBERT THUMB.

A POSTCARD from Prof. E. Schwyzer of Zürich brought me in August the news of the death of Prof. Albert Thumb of Strassburg. He died on August 14 of a constitutional complaint which I fancy was unsuspected, although a very serious breakdown some three years ago was a warning that all was not well. From Adolf Deissmann I learn that he was only fifty. Well may my friend call for a closing of ranks among scholars who love the studies in which Thumb was so unrivalled a pioneer! But alas! German scholars who are men of goodwill must accomplish much before the Indo-germanische Gesellschaft can meet again, or lives devoted to learning join forces once more in the common pursuit of knowledge.

Thumb's range of learning and research was immense, covering well-nigh everything that came under the comprehensive heading Indo-European linguistic. But of course it was Greek in which his contribution was really memorable. The prehistoric foundations of Greek he laid bare in the researches that found systematic place in his new edition of Brugmann's masterly Grammar. The ancient Greek dialects he set forth in a concise summary that left little to be desired for accuracy and clearness. And in particular he led the way from the philological side, as Deissmann from the theological, in teaching Hellenists that the 'decadence' of Greek was richly worth studying for its own sake. To complete our knowledge of the period when Greek was the *lingua franca* of the Roman Empire, he studied deeply the patois of the modern peasant, the dialects of natural

and genuine Greek of to-day, descended directly from the *κοινή*, and capable in skilled hands of revealing many unsuspected facts about the popular language of the early Christian centuries. His extraordinary power of grasping a living idiom enabled him not only to lay hold of the Modern Greek *ὁμιλουμένη* in general, but to delineate its dialects with a sureness of touch that a native might envy. In these researches he won the enthusiastic appreciation of the Greeks, whose ethnology he studied with keen insight, and with profoundly sympathetic interest.

British scholars in Manchester and Cambridge had an opportunity of making his acquaintance in October, 1913, when he came to stay with me for a week, lecturing at the University and the Rylands Library, and proceeding to Cambridge on his way home. He knew British work thoroughly. If I may put in a personal illustration, I would recall how he went through the proofs of *Prolegomena* to a N.T. Greek Grammar, and at least twice called attention to articles in my own language which I had overlooked. The trouble he would take for the improvement of another man's work was greater than many men will bestow upon their own. His judgment was unfailing, even if his touch was somewhat heavy, as was natural in a scholar of his environment. His students were happily numerous, and drawn from other lands than his own; and we may earnestly hope that some of them will successfully take up the threads that have prematurely dropped from the master's hand. There were indications, among scanty though warm-hearted communications that reached me after the great gulf opened between us, that his view of the war was that

which is normal among his countrymen. But it is also certain that his would have been a powerful mediating influence in happier days, had he lived to see them; and British and French scholarship may mourn him as a German, while gratefully cherishing the memory of his unique services as a scholar.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

PAUL LIEBAERT.

THOUGH not killed on the field of battle, the young Belgian Abbé, Paul Liebaert, may be called a victim of the war. War was declared when he was recovering from a severe illness. With characteristic self-forgetfulness he refused to rest and laboured unceasingly, first as chaplain and almoner in his native town of Courtrai, then, when the British wounded prisoners began to arrive, in relief of their necessities. Not until his activities were stopped by the Germans did he seek and obtain permission to return to his quiet life at the Vatican Library. The loss of his private fortune gave him much anxiety about the future; but when Italy joined the Allies he determined to stay at Rome and look after the soldiers' sons. The work overtaxed his strength. He went off to hospital at Pallanza, where he has died of typhoid fever.

The son of a wealthy business man of Courtrai, he studied Palaeography at the Vatican Library under Padre Ehrle, and was put on the list of Scrittori or Assistant Librarians, on the unpaid list; so that his time was practically at his own disposal. He had the two chief requisites of the palaeographer—a good photographic camera and facilities for visiting the libraries of Europe; and with these advantages he laid such solid foundations for his life-work, that he bade fair to become a second Mabillon. Some two thousand photographs of Latin MSS., along with methodical notes of the scribes' practices, were promising material for future publications; but, apart from magazine-articles, all that he had accomplished before his death was the co-editorship of the '*Specimina Palaeographica Vaticana*.'

How far his papers admit of publication, I do not know. But it may not be out of place here to mention the chief results he had reached in his projected History of the Corbie Scriptorium, as I learned them in conversation with him last Easter. He had detected three types of minuscule favoured at different periods at Corbie. The earliest (*e.g.*, Paris 4403A, foll. 184^v sqq.; Paris 12239; Paris 13047) he called the empty type, from its peculiar form of the letter *e* when in ligature with *m* (or *n* or *r*, etc.). The second is the type seen in that famous Bible in Amiens Library, which was written during the abbacy of Maurdramnus (772-780). This Maurdramnus type, as he called it, was succeeded in the abbacy of Adelhard by the *ab*-type. Three valuable clues for dating and locating MSS. of c. 750—c. 815 have thus been discovered by his diligence.

Primitiæ juvenis; but enough to show how much Latin Palaeography has lost by his premature death.

W. M. LINDSAY.

LEONARD CHEESMAN.

THE Vice-Chancellor of Oxford in his October address chose out for mention three Oxford men as noteworthy among the many who have died in the war with all, or nearly all, their promise unachieved. One of these had seemed about to do good work in labour problems, one in politics; the third was G. L. Cheesman. And, indeed, the study of history has seldom lost so real an 'inheritor of unfulfilled renown.'

The tale of his life is short. He was a scholar of Winchester and (1903-7) of New College. After taking his degree, he taught for a year at Christ Church, and then returned to New College as Fellow (June, 1908). With the help of the College, he gave a year to travel in the provinces of the Roman Empire. In 1910 he began regular teaching and lecturing, and began at the same time his own work on Roman history, and in particular on Roman military history. In 1911 he gained the Arnold Prize with an essay on the Roman auxilia; he wrote

also for the *Journal of Roman Studies* and for the *Classical Review*; he took active part in Roman excavations in England, as at Corbridge and at Ribchester; he travelled, to deepen further his knowledge of the Empire; in July, 1914, he passed the final proofs of a volume on the Roman auxilia, which had grown out of the earlier essay. Then war broke out; at once he sought a commission (he had been a volunteer in old days), and was gazetted to the Tenth Hampshires. Many of us were hoping that his peculiar qualities and knowledge of languages (Serbian among them) might be used for appropriate service, but the War Office had no use for special attainments. On August 10 he fell near Suvla Bay. His age was thirty.

His powers had ripened slowly, but well. They were such as school education, even at Winchester, does not always reach; at Oxford they became clear. I well remember the first time that I saw him; he came at the end of a lecture to put a query which none but a thorough historian could have framed. Within a few years, all who knew him felt that he was first-rate—that, if he lived, he was singularly sure to do really great historical work. He united many powers—he read fast, remembered accurately what he read, kept his knowledge at his own command and con-

trolled it lightly and easily. He was practical, too; when he studied the Roman army, he compared it with other armies, and sought advice from modern men and systems. Above all, he wielded a sound and clear historical judgment; he could form original views and avoid guesswork. His one volume, on the Roman auxilia, shows his merits plainly; it will long be the leading book on its subject.

He was much more than a student. His devotion to learning was coupled with a strong personal character, with unfailing unselfishness, extraordinary width of interest, great brightness of manner; need I add, in the words of Tacitus, 'integritatem atque abstinentiam in tanto viro referre iniuria virtutum fuerit'? Of his personal friendships I do not here speak; far outside them, he was able to charm and inspire with his own keenness and life all of his pupils who were capable of intellectual development; he never failed to add to the gaiety and the good sense of those around him. We in Oxford have lost many men whose places can never be filled; no one will wish to compare them—οὐς μὲν γὰρ τις ἔπεμψεν, οἶδεν. But the loss of G. L. Cheesman is in every way heavy—to his college, to our joint educational work, to our research, to historical study.

F. HAVERFIELD.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The commentary of *Græculus* on the epigram quoted on p. 192 of the *Classical Review* (Sept. 1915) is exhaustive and sound. I can only add one or two remarks. Every school-master knows that τεύξαι is a late nineteenth-century form of τυχεῖν, very common at the present day. The meaning is clear: 'For it was right that they (your friends) should find you as their guide,' etc. The Latin translation bears this out. The conjecture that ἀλαζμονέοισι comes from ἀλάζων is tempting in view of such forms as μείζοντος (gen. of μείζων) occurring frequently at the matriculation stage; for the substitution of the middle for the active of a supposed participle would be easy. But here again the Latin points to the meaning, 'wandering' (*flectere gressus*).

Δ.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—Professor Haverfield, in his interesting note on 'Herodotus and Babylon' published in your last issue (pp. 169-170), describes Babylon as a city of some eight miles in extent on the left bank of the Euphrates, with an extension of uncertain extent on the right bank. As he rightly says, 'Such are the remains as known at present.'

He then goes on to say that Mr. How and myself, in our recent edition of Herodotus, 'decided that this could not be the Herodotean city, because it had a wall only on two sides and its river front was unprotected.'

If he will look again at our edition (I. p. 136), he will see that we were referring to something quite different. I was there writing only of Weissbach's plan (published in *Der Alte Orient*, 1904); I

said that, 'not to mention other difficulties, it represents Babylon as having no defence on the West, except the river Euphrates, which is absurd.' This plan, if he will consult Weissbach (p. 13), he will see is called 'An attempt at a reconstruction of Babylon in the time of Nebuchadnezzar.'

In spite of Weissbach's eminence as an Orientalist, it seemed (and seems) to me impossible. I may add that, besides showing two-thirds of the river front unguarded, it gives an 'inner wall' which incloses nothing. I therefore in my note gave as briefly as I could my reason for neglecting what professed to be a plan of the city based on the most modern excavation. I rejected also Oppert's great square of some sixty miles (p. 137).

It seems to me the time has not come to

plan out exactly the size of ancient Babylon. The west bank of the Euphrates has not yet been explored, and we are quite without data as to how large a part of Babylon spread over it. It is to be hoped that when this present war is over, the work will be continued by English excavators.

Meantime I am quite prepared to accept the conclusions which Professor Haverfield puts so clearly and well, as to the main city on the left bank. Only I would suggest that we cannot infer anything as to the right-bank city from the absence of palaces and temples in it. The comparison of London south of the river warns us that we may have a vast extension of dwelling-houses, with few or no outbuildings of architectural or historical interest.

J. WELLS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Ahlberg (A. W.) *C. Sallusti Crispi Bellum Iugurthinum, recensuit A. W. A. Gotsburgi Eranos Forlay. Collectio Scriptorum Veterum Vpsaliensis.* 9" x 6". Pp. 152. 2 kr. 25 öre.

American Philological Association (Transactions and Proceedings of, 1914). Vol. xlv. 9" x 6". Pp. 254 + cii. Boston : Ginn and Co., 1915.

Annacker (C.) *Some Parallels and Differences in Greek and Latin Syntax.* 6½" x 4¼". Pp. 32. London : Blackie and Son, 1915. Limp cloth, 9d.

Aristotelica. By Herbert Richards. 7½" x 5". Pp. x + 167. London : Grant Richards, Ltd., 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.

Church Quarterly Review. Vol. LXXX., No. 160. Pp. 257-508.

Classical Philology : A Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in the Languages, Literature, History, and Life of Classical Antiquity. Vol. X., No. 3. July, 1915. Pp. 241-364.

Dimsdale (M. S.) *A History of Latin Literature.* 8" x 5½". Pp. x + 549. London : W. Heinemann, 1915. Cloth, 6s.

Gardner (E. A.) *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture* (New Edition). 8" x 5¼". Pp. xxxii + 605. London : Macmillan and Co., 1915. Cloth, 10s.

Harrer (G. A.) *Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria* (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9" x 6". Pp. 94. Princeton University Press, 1915.

Loeb Classical Library. Apuleius, the Golden Ass (Adlington and Gaselee), pp. xxiv + 608 ; Pliny, Letters (Melmoth and Hutchinson), 2 vols., pp. xvi + 535 and viii + 440 ; Pindar's Odes (Sandys), pp. xlx + 635 ; Lucian (Har-

mon), vol. ii., pp. viii + 520 ; Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homeric (Evelyn White), pp. xlviii + 627, 6½" x 4½". London : Heinemann, 1915. 5s. net per vol.

Monist (The) A Quarterly Magazine devoted to the Philosophy of Science. Vol. XXV., No. 3. July, 1915. Pp. 321-480.

Morey (C. R.) *Lost Mosaics and Frescoes of Rome.* Princeton Monographs, IV. 10¾" x 8". Pp. xii + 70. Oxford : University Press, 1915. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Oldfather (W. A.) and *Canter* (H. V.) *The Defeat of Varus and the German Frontier Policy of Augustus.* 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 120. Urbana : University of Illinois. 75 cents.

Sonnenschein (E. A.) *A First Latin Grammar for Schools.* 7½" x 5". Pp. 126. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Starkey (C. E. F.) *Verse Translations from Classic Authors* (New Edition). 7½" x 4¾". Pp. 164. Hove, Sussex : Combridge, 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.

Storer (E.) *Poems and Fragments of Sappho* (the Poets' Translation Series). 6¾" x 4¾". Pp. 12. London : The Egoist, 1915. 4d. net.

Strong (Mrs. A.) *Apotheosis and After Life.* 10" x 6¼". Pp. xx + 293. With 36 plates. London : Constable and Co., Ltd., 1915. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Theologisch Tijdschrift. Edited by E. D. Eerdmans, Aflivering and Co. 9½" x 6". Pp. 359-426. Leiden : S. C. van Doesburgh, 1915.

Todd (O. J.) *Quo modo Aristophanes rem temporalem in fabulis suis tractaverit quaevisit O. I. T.* From Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. xxvi. 9" x 5¼". Pp. 72.

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE *AENEID*.

THE *Aeneid* is the unfinished work of the last ten years of Virgil's life; and he is said to have estimated that three years more would be required to complete it. There is little evidence as to the state in which he left his MS., or rather, perhaps, the different MS. copies which he kept by him and worked upon: and though it is probable that these were not destroyed by his executors, there is no record of any subsequent collation of them with the published text. The autograph (*idiographus liber Vergilii*) mentioned as extant by Aulus Gellius, about A.D. 165, as well as the *liber qui fuit ex domo atque familia Vergilii* collated by Hyginus within the generation after Virgil's death, may in each case have been only a MS. of the *Georgics*. So far as external evidence goes, it seems impossible to get behind the authorised text as issued by Varius and Tucca. The only important exceptions to this general statement are a few notes in the Servian Commentary (referred to henceforth, for the sake of brevity, simply as Servius). At *Aen.* III. 204 it quotes the three lines, *Hinc Pelopis gentes . . . circumsumimur undis*, and adds, *hi versus circumducti inventi dicuntur et extra paginam in mundo*. This note is tantalisingly brief: it does not tell us what the authority for this tradition was, nor whether the fact of the lines being so found was notified by Varius himself, or by some later scholar who had seen the original MS. Even more elusive is the note at VI. 289, which runs, *quidam dicunt versus alios*

hos a poeta hoc loco relictos, qui ab eius emendatoribus sublatis sint, and then gives the four lines, *Gorgonis in medio . . . vincula caudis*. It may be remarked that both these passages are thoroughly Virgilian in rhythm and diction.

Nor, either here or elsewhere, is there any information which throws light on the important question whether Varius published the *Aeneid* with or without any textual notes, or any preface explaining the way in which he had performed his editorial task. Even as to the general principles on which he and his co-editor proceeded our information is very scanty. Jerome (based on Suetonius) says that they *emendarunt sub lege ea ut nihil adderent*; and this statement is repeated somewhat more fully by Servius in the words, *Augustus . . . hac lege iussit emendare ut superflua demerent, nihil adderent tamen*. Nisus the grammarian, according to Donatus, had heard *a senioribus*—that is to say, from Virgil's own contemporaries, or at least his contemporaries of the younger generation—that the four lines *Ille ego . . . Martis* at the opening of the poem were struck out by Varius. But whether the phrase *superflua demere* was meant to cover only passages in the Virgilian autograph which were inserted marginally or otherwise marked as tentative and subject to reconsideration, or whether it indicates that the editors were empowered to strike out, and did strike out, other passages which in their judgment were better omitted or could not be placed in the structure of the

poem, must remain a matter of conjecture. Nor is there any clear evidence how much latitude they allowed themselves in rearrangement of order, or how much discretion they exercised in the insertion of detached fragments in one place rather than another, or whether they struck out some of the more obvious *tibicines* while retaining those which they thought might pass muster. It is clear that they did not feel themselves called upon to remove repetitions or minor inconsistencies, as for instance the double slaying of Cretheus (IX. 774 and XII. 538), or the attribution in VII. 123 of the prophecy of Celaeno (III. 255) to Anchises.

In any case, the editorial work was done with great care and skill. It was indeed done so well that the *Aeneid* has ever since been more or less unconsciously regarded and handled as a finished work. This is the right side on which to err. But it is still possible, by the refined methods of modern analysis, to trace lines of fissure and planes of construction, and so to build up, though imperfectly, a sort of stereoscopic picture of the poem in its process of development. This is a subject which has not been thoroughly handled since Ribbeck's *Prolegomena*. It is unfortunate that Ribbeck's prosaic taste combined with defects in his scholarship to discredit not only the results which he put forward, but the method, in itself sound, by which he reached them. With sufficient skill and instinct, a good deal yet remains to be elicited from the internal evidence of the *Aeneid* itself with regard to the strata of material it embodies, the changes it underwent in the making, the development of Virgil's handling, and the state of relative completeness in which various parts of it were left.

The following notes are put forward in the hope of inducing students of Virgil to take up this inquiry and pursue it more fully as well as more closely. They deal with that preliminary part of it which concerns incomplete passages in the *Aeneid*. It is hoped, in a subsequent number of the *Classical Review*, to extend the inquiry to other parts of the subject; inconsistencies or repetitions, traces of the over-working of an

earlier draft, and inferences which may be drawn as to the relative date of different parts of the poem, and as to the changes which its scope and structure underwent in the author's mind. If an excuse is needed for dealing with such matters at such a time, it is this: that this study may lead to a finer and deeper appreciation of one of the greatest of poets, and thus help to preserve civilisation.

There are 55 unfinished lines in the *Aeneid*, or 56 if in V. 595 we reject the second half of the line, which is missing in P and M¹. The story of the second half of VI. 165 having been extemporised by Virgil when reading the passage aloud seems to point to an early MS. tradition in which this line was also left unfinished.

The unfinished lines are distributed over all twelve books. No safe conclusion can be drawn from their relative frequency. It is noticeable, however, that in VI. and XII., the two books in which the general workmanship is most elaborate, and in which Virgil is perhaps at his greatest, there is only one apiece. On the other hand, the largest number of all (9) is in II., which is also a book of extreme elaboration; it exceeds even the number (7) in III., a book which more obviously than most lacks the *ultima manus*, and bears the traces, as is highly probable, of the change of plan by which the story of the seven years' wanderings was transformed from direct narrative into narrative placed in the mouth of Aeneas when the composition of the poem had already made some progress.

As was noted by Donatus, all the hemistichs, except III. 340, give a complete sense. The theory that III. 340 is a deliberate aposiopesis, like the *Quos ego* of I. 135, is perhaps rather plausible than probable. But among the other 54 there are distinctions to be drawn.

I. Five are completely detachable, being mere notes marking the beginning or end of a speech (*Haec effata*, V. 653; *Rex prior haec*, VIII. 469; *Tum sic effatur*, IX. 295; *Cui Liger*, X. 580; *Turnus ad haec*, XII. 631). These might be called not so much incomplete lines as indications of lines to be inserted; they are *tibicines* in the full sense of the term.

2. Five more are also detachable, in the sense that while they continue, and add to, what precedes them, no gap and no abruptness of transition would be left if they were removed. These are *Munera laetitiamque dii*, I. 636; *Stans celsa in puppi*, III. 527; *Ergo iussa parat*, IV. 503; *Unum pro multis dabitur caput*, V. 815; *Audaces fortuna iuvat*, X. 284.

3. In no less than seventeen cases, the hemistich forms part of a passage of a line and a half which is similarly detachable. These are I. 559-60, II. 232-3, 345-6, 622-3, III. 660-1, IV. 399-400, 515-6, V. 573-4, VI. 93-4, 834-5, VII. 128-9, 438-9, 454-5, 759-60, VIII. 40-1, IX. 166-7, 720-1. It seems not unlikely that some at least of these passages were *marginalia* which the editors decided to incorporate into the text; and it is of course possible that they came to the contrary decision with other passages of a similar kind which have consequently disappeared.

4. In the twenty-eight cases left, the broken line is part of the structure of its context, and could not be removed without leaving a break in the sense or the connexion.

So far, we have been dealing with passages where the incompleteness is obvious and demonstrable, because there is a patent gap in the metre. But where Virgil left a passage incomplete, it does not follow that he broke off in the middle of a line. Where he stopped at the end of a line, and the syntax happened to be complete as it stood, the traces of incompleteness (failing any mark of it left by him on his MS. and recorded by the editors) must be largely conjectural. Here a finer critical sense must be called in, which may, and sometimes does, seize the fact that the characteristic Virgilian evolution of thought or of rhythm is broken off prematurely. This is fascinating but slippery ground. But there are at least three passages in which incompleteness of this kind seems almost certain; for apart from considerations of rhythm, it is really impossible to make sense out of them as they stand.

V. 317, *Simul ultima signant*. Here it is sufficient to remark, without com-

ment, the wild work made by commentators in their attempts to force a meaning out of the words.

VIII. 65, *Hic mea magna domus celsis caput urbibus exit*; here rhythm, no less than sense, calls for another line to complete the period; and the words of Aeneas in his reply, *quocumque solo pulcherrimus exis*, point in the same direction.

XII. 218, *Tum magis, ut propius cernunt non viribus aequis*. Here Ribbeck was unquestionably right in noting a *manca sententia*.

To these may be added, with less confidence, a few other passages which end with an abruptness unlike the characteristic Virgilian movement. Two of these are in Book VI.; 119-123, where not only is the syntax irregular without any clear reason for irregularity in the passion of what is said or in agitation of the speaker, but the final rhythm of *et mi genus ab Iove summo* leaves the ear unsatisfied; and 179-182, where *advolvunt ingentes montibus ornos* similarly leaves the cadence suspended (cf. for contrast the long smooth movement of *Georg.* III. 378, *Congestaque robora totasque advolvere focis ulmos ignique dedere*, and of *Aen.* XI. 135-8, *Evertunt actas ad sidera pinus, | robora nec cuneis et olentem scindere cedrum, | nec plaustris cessant vectare gementibus ornos*). In this connexion it should be noted that it is a feature of the matured Virgilian style to continue the period a line further than where in the hands of a less potent master of rhythm it would conclude. This is also characteristic of Milton; in both poets it is this over-arching superflux of rhythm which gives their period its unique richness. In reading the *Aeneid* or *Paradise Lost* aloud (as both ought to be read) one has to be always on guard against concluding the cadence prematurely. Instances might be cited by the score; I give two from each poem, marking the 'superflux' in italic:

*Sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penates,
Hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere
Magna pererrato statuas quae denique ponto.*

*Quam densis frondibus atrum
Urget utrinque latus, tenuis quo semita ducit
Angustaeque ferunt fauces aditusque maligni.*

And good he made thee : but to persevere
He left it in thy power, ordained thy will
By nature free, not overruled by fate
Inextricable, or strict necessity.

Though heaven's King
Ride on thy wings, and thou with thy compeers
Used to the yoke, draw'st his triumphant wheels
In progress through the road of heaven star-paved.

It is also, however, to be noted that in the later work of both Virgil and Milton there is some amount of reaction towards short and even broken rhythms. It is particularly marked in *Paradise Regained*. Instances in the *Aeneid* are XI. 635, *pugna aspera surgit*, and XII. 480, *volat avia longe*, both in sharp contrast to what may be called the normal Virgilian manner as illustrated by XI. 647,

dant funera ferro
Certantes, pulchramque petunt per volnera mortem;

or by XII. 369,

fert impetus ipsum
Et cristam adverso curru quatit aura volantem.

Indeed the occurrence of these short rhythms is, I think, like the deliberately paratactic construction in passages like XII. 355-8, *Sistit equos biuges, et . . . atque . . . et . . . et . . . atque*, a sign of late composition, and an element in determining the relative date of different parts of the *Aeneid*.

These considerations bear upon two lines of notorious difficulty: VI. 383, *gaudet cognomine terrae* [*terra*], and XII. 790, *Adsistunt contra certamine* [*certamina*] *Martis anhelis*. In both, the variant readings of the MSS. are due to the fact that the language is abrupt and the syntax obscure. They may be instances of Virgil's later 'short-hand notation'; but in both, incompleteness at the end of the line may also, and perhaps with equal probability, be suspected.

Further, a passage may be incomplete, not only because it breaks off prematurely whether in the middle or at the end of a line, but also because its beginning is wanting. More than once we find in the *Aeneid* a paragraph which is 'finished' in the sense of reaching its full conclusion, but which begins abruptly, and wants one or more lines

prefixed in order to engraft it into its place in the poem. A good instance is X. 747-754. This is a detachable passage of fighting, containing a number of otherwise unknown or unimportant names. It has no special relevance where it stands, beyond the fact that some paragraph, of this kind or of another, is needed, as the transition from the *Aristeia* of Mezentius (ll. 689-746) to the episode in which both he and Lausus are slain by Aeneas, and which fills the remainder of the book. The lines were written as the material for such a paragraph, and in his final revision Virgil would (unless he had preferred to replace them by something else) no doubt have 'written them on' by prefixing one or more lines of connexion. This kind of case is quite parallel to the other, already noted, in which a speech is temporarily left in the air with a mere note of a couple of words for the introductory line (or lines) before it, or for the continuing and connecting line (or lines) after it (*Turnus ad haec*, or *Haec effata*). Other instances, less immediately obvious, are VIII. 81-5, five lines describing the sacrifice of the sow and her litter to Juno, which are thrust into the middle of an otherwise continuous narrative, and interrupt the close connexion between ll. 79, 80 and ll. 86 sqq.; and the passage beginning, *Infrenant alii currus* XII. 287, unless we take the preceding line and a half (*fugit ipse Latinus pulsatos referens infecto foedere divos*) to be a rather awkward parenthesis.

Once more, there may be a gap, of one or more integral lines, discernible in the middle of a sentence. This is generally admitted in VI. 601-3:

Quid memorem Lapithas, Ixiona Pirithoumque
Quo super atra silex iam iam lapsura cadentique
Imminet adsimilis.

This, the reading of R, is generally accepted by modern editors; and, if so, both sense and grammar require the insertion of a line preceding this one and introducing Tantalus. Hirtzel's Oxford text marks a lost line. The reading *Quos super* of the other principal MSS. satisfies grammar, but makes nonsense, as the overhanging stone and the untouchable banquet would thus

apply to the persons mentioned in l. 601, the Lapithae, Ixion, and Pirithous. But that line itself is not in place; the wheel of Ixion, and the seat of Theseus, whose crime was perpetrated and punished jointly with Pirithous, come later (ll. 616-7), after the general statement of ll. 608-14. In this same passage, the difficult if not impossible

Ne quaere doceri
Quam poenam aut quae forma viros fortunave
mersit

suggests another incompleteness of an even more subtle and undetectable kind; the absence, that is to say, of a whole line, not however an integral line, but one consisting (as happens in copyists' work) of the end of one line and the beginning of the next:

Ne quaere doceri
Quam poenam aut . . .
. . . quae forma viros fortunave mersit.

A similar suspicion is aroused by the harsh and awkward wording of XII. 161. It seems not impossible that what Virgil wrote there, as he meant it, was

Interea reges . . .
. . . ingenti mole Latinus
Quadriugo vehitur curru.

There are pretty plainly passages where the author's MS. gave (or had notes for) alternative readings, and it was not clear what his own final choice would have been. In these the editors presumably published either what appeared to them to be his own latest version, or what they thought the best of the alternatives indicated: but as to this, conjecture is idle. There are a few cases in which they seem to have published both of two lines which were really alternatives. Such a duplication has long been suspected in *Georg.* IV. 291-2:

Et diversa ruens septem discurrit in ora
Et viridem Aegyptum nigra fecundat harena.

But there is a much more probable instance in *Aen.* V. 603-4. At the end of the elaborate and very highly finished account of the *ludus Troiae* (the game

of the sow and the little pigs), Virgil passes on to the destruction of the fleet at the instigation of Juno. This new episode begins with l. 605:

Dum variis tumulo referunt sollemnia ludis
Irim de caela misit Saturnia Iuno
Iliacam ad classem.

But it is preceded by two separate single lines, each complete in itself:

Hac celebrata tenus sancto certamina patri.
Hinc primum Fortuna fidem mutata novavit.

Neither line is necessary for sense or connexion. It is highly probable that they are two alternative suggestions written in the margin by Virgil for consideration, one below the other, and that the Editors, finding them there and neither of them 'ringed,' put them both in as they were.

Distinct from the kinds of incompleteness hitherto discussed are the passages where difficulty arises from the Virgilian autograph having been left indistinct or ambiguous rather than strictly incomplete; where, that is to say, it gave suggestions of variant readings without making it clear which Virgil had decided to adopt. Under this head seem to come three well-known cruxes: IV. 436, *Quam mihi cum dederit* [*dederis*] *cumulatam* [*cumulata*] *morte remittam* [*relinquam*]: VII. 307, *Quod scelus aut Lapithas* [*Lapithis*] *tantum aut Calydonea* [*Calydone*] *merentem* [*merente, merentes*]: and VII. 543, *Deserit Hesperiam et caeli convexa* [*conversa*] *per auras*. In this last passage *convexa* is the reading of all the good MSS. except M¹, and also of Asper, Donatus, Probus, and Servius; but it is unintelligible. We may surmise that in the autograph the line stood:

Deserit Hesperiam et caeli convexa
conversa per auras;

and it may even be that Virgil meant to expand the single line into two by inserting words between *convexa* and *conversa*.

J. W. MACKAIL.

PINDAR, *PYTHIAN* II. 90 FF.

στάθμας δέ τινας ἐλκόμενοι
περισσᾶς ἐνέπαξαν ἔλκος ὀδυναρὸν ἐᾷ
πρόσθε καρδία
πρὶν ὅσα φροντίδι μητιῶνται τυχεῖν.

IT is not necessary to discuss in detail the many and fantastic interpretations which have been offered. That task has been performed by Professor Norwood in *Class. Quart.* ix. 1, January, 1915. Mr. R. G. Bury, in *Class. Rev.* xxix. 3, May, 1915, having adequately disposed of Mr. Norwood's own 'excessively long sword,' has presented Pindar with a 'long chariot-pole' for which there is no lexicographical evidence. I venture, in turn, to offer a very small emendation.

Editors have complained that the pun ἐλκόμενοι ἔλκος is frigid. So it is if ἐλκόμενοι introduces a new and unexpected metaphor; but not, I think, if it is already a commonplace for Pindar's audience that persons who are φθονεροί are persons who always ἔλκονται. Well, a commonplace it is:

Theognis 30—

πέπνυσο, μηδ' αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασι
μηδ' ἀδίκοις
τιμὰς μηδ' ἀρετὰς ἔλκεο μηδ' ἄφενος.

Euripides *fr.* 419 N—

βία νυν ἔλκετ', ὦ κακοὶ, τιμὰς, βροτοὶ,
καὶ κτᾶσθε πλοῦτον, παντόθεν θηρώμενοι,
σύμμικτα μὴ δίκαια καὶ δίκαι' ὁμοῦ.
ἔπειτ' ἀμᾶσθε τῶνδε δύστηνον θέρος.

That is from a speech which is probably concerned with a tyrant's rise and fall (see *fr.* 420 N).

Plato, *Rep.* v. 464 B. Communism makes our guardians μὴ διασπᾶν τὴν πόλιν . . . τὸν μὲν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οἰκίαν ἔλκοντα ὃ τι ἂν δύνηται χωρὶς τῶν ἄλλων κτήσασθαι . . .

For the idea, which is specially applied to the grasping ambitions of kings or of those who plot against kings, see my note on Eur. *H. F.* 773 ff. in *Class. Rev.*, May, 1915. The use of ἔλκομαι, in the sense 'I drag to myself . . .', 'I am on the make . . .', lies behind Hesiod's τῆς δὲ δίκης ῥόθος ἐλκομένης ἢ κ' ἄνδρες ἄγωσι δωρόφαγοι (*Op.* 220),

which Headlam rightly quotes when he reads, in *Eum.* 555, τὰ πόλλ' ἄγοντα παντόφυρτ' ἀνευ δίκας βιαίως. So Pindar's scandalous νόμος, which ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον, is, for Callicles and men like him, Nature's law. See Thompson's note on *Gorgias* 484B, and notice especially 488 B, ἄγειν βία . . . καὶ ἄρχειν καὶ πλεόν ἔχειν . . . It is worth noticing that in Callimachus *h. Ap.* 109 Φθόνος is appropriately rebuked by an allusion to his own characteristic method of grab: the great river τὰ πολλὰ . . . ἔλκει, including rubbish. Remember also Hesiod, *Op.* 37, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ ἀρπάξων ἐφόρεις, and notice that the traditional notion of the greedy usurper or plotter has its roots in Homeric human nature, *Il.* ii. 122, 149, 170, 231. The suspicions of Creon and of Oedipus are derived from the same stock of ideas (*Soph. Ant.* 312, 326; *O.T.* 382, 388, and the much misunderstood chorus, 873, 889).

Now, the scholiast saw that this was the notion. He had our text before him, and valiantly tried to interpret it. Editors do him less than justice when they curtly dismiss him with: 'he thinks of a measuring-line,' or 'he speaks of land and measuring.' Still more unjust is the innuendo that he thought of so odd a performance, with so odd a line, and so curiously περισσᾶς (stretched over more space than it ought to cover), as Professor Gildersleeve has invented. The scholiast sees that ἐλκόμενοι must be something that the envious normally do, that the phrase must refer to the frustrated designs, and that περισσᾶς must somehow imply that the φθονεροί try to get too much . . . they come to grief before they get ὅσα φροντίδι μητιῶνται. So he boldly asserts: τὸ δὲ στάθμας φροντίδος, and proceeds: σταθμῶμενοι, φησί, καὶ περιγράφοντες μεγάλα τινα μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, προωδυνήθησαν πρὶν τυχεῖν ὃν ἐπιζητοῦσι καὶ ἐλπίζουσιν.

With the text as it stands nothing better has been suggested. Let us be just to the scholiast. He knows that στάθμη is a line of some sort, not

a chariot-pole, nor a halter, nor a ram, nor a balance, nor a weight; he knows that *περισσᾶς στάθμας* does not mean 'a line stretched too tight,' or 'a mark too far off,' but *an excessive line*: and I think he knows that *ἐλκόμενοι* means 'grabbing their gain.' His word *περιγράφοντες* should inform us that he is not just vaguely 'thinking of a measuring line,' nor vaguely 'speaking of land and measuring.' You put a line round land to mark it off as your own, staking out, as we say, a claim. If you went, as spectator or as merchant, to a Panegyris, you appropriated, with due formality, a plot for your tent or your stall: see Aristophanes, *Pax* 879, with the scholiast's explanation. When a mad king said, 'I give you the sun for your pay,' an astute boy cried, 'We accept your gift, O king!' then drew a line round the patch of sunshine on the floor, thereby claiming as his own, not the sun, but the hearth and home upon which it shone (Hdt. viii. 137). Such a line Heracles drew when he appropriated (for Zeus) the Altis at Olympia, making the measure of it, I suspect, the extent of the ground covered by the booty he had won from Augeas and his nephews: that is the truth which in *Ol.* x. 47-65 Time and Pindar reveal! The reading, Ἄλιν, though it was quite rightly rejected by Aristodemus and his friends, may help dim eyes to see that, according to Pindar, Heracles called the precinct Altis, instead of Alsos, because the word recalled his triumph over Ἄλις: a theory, we may be sure, that the Eleians would not trouble to keep alive. But *περιγράφοντες* is creditable to the scholiast for another reason too. Out of the notion of 'marking off' a piece of land, there grew the metaphorical use 'to limit,' 'to circumscribe,' and the association with that 'Due Measure' which the *φθονεροί* always ignore. Follow this word from Thuc. vii. 49 to Xen. *Mem.* i. 4, 12, and Aristotle, *Metaphys.* x. 7, 1, and Diodor. iii. 16 (the Ichthyophagoi, who eat οὐ πρὸς μέτρον ἢ σταθμόν . . . ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκάστου βούλησιν, τὴν φυσικὴν ὄρεξιν ἔχοντες τῆς ἀπολαύσεως περιγραφῆν), and Polyb. 21. 11, 4. Notice that in Plat. *Leg.* 768C *περιγραφή* means,

not merely 'an outline sketch,' but 'a line, including and excluding': τὰ μὲν εἴρηκε, τὰ δὲ ἀπολείπει σχέδον.

The scholiast, then, treats the phrase as a lyrical variant for *παντόθεν ἐλκόμενοι, ἐξ ἀπάντος κερδαίνοντες*. The genitive is what Professor Gildersleeve calls a 'whence-case': *στάθμας* means 'a measured line': *περισσᾶς* means 'too long,' and therefore 'enclosing too large an area': the effect, to those who are familiar with *στάθμη* as the Just Line, the Line of Right, is a sort of *oxymoron*, for which *τινος* apologises ('what I may call an excessive limit-line'). The phrase means something like 'trying to grab their gain from too wide a field.' The *φθονερός* treats the world as his oyster.

As compared with the imaginations of modern learning, this interpretation is simple and sensible. But I doubt whether it can stand. *στάθμας* is not exactly *περιγραφή*, and the notion of 'drawing one's gain from a given area' is not naturally expressed in a phrase which substitutes the line for the space enclosed: above all, we need an object for *ἐλκόμενοι*. I therefore suggest—

*στάθμας δέ τινες ἐλκόμενοι
περίσσ' αἰὲν, ἔπαζαν.*

I suggest that *τινες* became *τινος* and *περισσαί* became *περισσᾶς*. The meaning now is perfectly clear. And the whole poem gains in effect.

Hiero is a fortunate prince: of course he must be duly reminded of the limitations of his mortality. But Pindar is able to wrap up that safe, conventional, and expected moral, in verses which denounce the enemies and rivals of the prince. It is worth while to notice how he achieves this end:

15 ff. Cinyras, a king and favourite of Aphrodite and Apollo, is celebrated by grateful Cyprians:

18. So Hiero, friend of Ares, Artemis, Hermes, Poseidon, is sung by grateful Epizephyrian maidens:

21 ff. And gratitude is the lesson Ixion had to learn and teach.

25 ff. He was admitted to the society of the gods, and his head was turned:

30. His crimes were the shedding of kindred blood—not with-

out treacherous craft, and the attempt on the bride of the All-Highest. He did not observe the Mean in his desires. (Surely there is no doubt of the political application here?)

39. But Zeus outwitted the crafty, with fatal results to him and his offspring!

49. God accomplishes all according to his intent and expectation . . . he brings down the proud and gives glory to others. My business, however, is to avoid evil-speaking, which, as Archilochus found, does not pay. To be rich—given material good-luck—in Wisdom, is the best.

See how skilfully the theme of human limitations is introduced. Ostensibly it illustrates the fate of men like Hiero's rivals. But, for an audience which knows the lyrical method, it is the reminder also to the prince that the gods alone are always happy, strong, and safe. That is why the poet insists that he is no evil-speaker. And he sums up, for the moment, the delicate and flattering warning with his praise of Wisdom and Good Fortune. We need not analyse the next passage, but should notice that the evil-speakers of l. 61 who 'wrestle but achieve nothing, fools and empty-minded,' like Ixion, (26) are duly contrasted with the gods (49).

When the praise of Hiero has been performed, we pass to the famous attack upon false friends and evil-plotters. Hiero is advised to 'be his own good self, having been informed' by the poet how much that means! He is also to prefer the candid truthfulness of Pindar to the flattery of those who, behind his back, will slander him and plot against him. In effect, of course, Pindar is the most egregious flatterer of them all; but this is how he wraps his flattery in a cloak of candour:

72. Now I have told you what you are: your task is to be yourself! Like Rhadamanthus, be an honest man, preferring honesty like mine to the monkey-tricks that children admire, the cunning that the whispering plotters practice when they fawn.

76. The slanderer's whisper hurts himself as well as his victim. Oh, yes, of course, he's as crafty as a fox . . . but does it really pay?

79. No, nothing comes of it. Honest I ride the waves like a cork! And crafty persons really lose all influence—with excellent rulers like yourself. Though, of course, they go on fawning and twisting and plotting.

84. I am not so brazen and so rash. I am one that would really love my friends . . . reserving my cunning for enemies, whom I shall pursue as relentlessly as a wolf,¹ and cunningly too. Such straightforward candour as mine is the road to true success in every kind of city.

Notice that the common objection to the morality of 84 ff. arises partly from a failure to appreciate the poem as a whole. The backbiters and plotters here in question are ungrateful people who, like Ixion-Polyzelus, have the privilege of admission to the society of the great, pretend to be friends, flatter, and yet bite. When Professor Gildersleeve asserts that 'Requital in full is antique; crooked ways of requital are not Pindaric,' he seems to imply a curious mistranslation of *πάν ἔρδοντα*, which he has just quoted (*Isth.* iii. 66). The Greek view, and the Pindaric view, is well expressed by Xen. *Ages.* xi. 4: *τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ φίλων ἐξαπαταμένους οὐκ ἔψεγε, τοὺς δὲ ὑπὸ πολεμίων πάμπαν κατεμέμφετο. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀπιστοῦντας ἐξαπατᾶν, σοφὸν ἔκρινε, τὸ δὲ πιστεύοντας ἀνόσιον.*

This brings us to our final *epode*: Candour is best policy, to speak truth, without flattery, without slander. 'And one should not strive against the god who to-day holds high the fortunes of one set of mortals, to-morrow gives to others great honour.' We have heard that before, at ll. 49-52, and there also this gentle reminder of human limita-

¹ The fox is treacherous; the wolf, though savage and cunning, is an open enemy, Aristotle *H.A.* i, i, 32 *γενναῖα καὶ ἀγρία καὶ ἐπιβουλα*, *Artemidorus* II. 12, p. 69 *πανούργον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ ὁμῶς χωροῦντα*, the characteristic in which he differs from the fox.

tions was coupled with the plea that Pindar is an honest friend, no slanderer. Was my interpretation there at fault? Well, what do you make of the next remark? 'But not even this makes the jealous less embittered.' Not even what? Surely, the thought that even princes are human, exposed to human vicissitude like themselves. 'Still, though they are so implacable, there are some people I could name who, because they are always trying to grab more than is right' (this recalls 34 μέτρον ὀρᾶν) 'hurt themselves before they get the great things for which they

scheme.' Then, finally, we repeat the old moral, suggested first in 49-52, repeated for Hiero and Pindar in 38, now clearly meaning that Pindar and all wise men, unlike the φθονεροί, will treat the prince as the prince himself will treat the gods; for, as Ixion was admitted to the high society of the gods, and proved ungrateful, so Pindar 'in his intercourse with the good' prays that he may have the grace to please them.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

PLUTARCHI MORALIA.

(Continued from Vol. XXVII., p. 262.)

385 C. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ φιλοσοφεῖν, ἔφη, τὸ ζητεῖν, τὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ ἀπορεῖν. Read τοῦ φιλοσοφεῖν, ἔφη, καὶ (or καὶ τοῦ) ζητεῖν <ἀρχή> (or <αἷτιον>) τὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ ἀπορεῖν.

387 C. εἰ τόδ' ἔστι, τόδε προηγείται. Rather προήγεται.

388 F. ὀνομάζεται δὴ? Had it not been for hiatus, the δὴ would probably have followed κόσμος.

392 D. Write καί for ἢ before μισοῦμεν.

395 C. ὦν (gold, silver, and bronze) συγχυθέντων καὶ συντακέντων ὄνομα τοῦ χαλκοῦ τῷ μείζονι τὸ πλήθος παρέσχευ.

τῷ μείζονι is unintelligible, for it certainly cannot mean 'the whole mass' nor (Bernardakis) 'by its predominance.' Write τῷ ἀμείνονι. The better metal was called by the name of the predominant: its own name (or names) did not appear. For the correction compare my *Aristophanes and Others*, p. 233. With τοῦ χαλκοῦ we might rather expect τὸ ὄνομα than ὄνομα.

397 B. ἡδονὴν γὰρ οὐ προσίεται τὸ ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἀνόν, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα (on earth) μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐρρίφη καὶ τὸ πλεῖστον αὐτῆς καὶ ὡς εἰσὶν εἰς τὰ ὦτα τῶν ἀνθρώπων συνερρήκεν, and again a few lines below λόγου περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἡδονῆς ἀπολαύσας.

In this passage, which relates to music and singing, μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς and in a less degree περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἡδονῆς have been found very obscure. Stepha-

nus conjectured μετὰ τῆς ᾠδῆς. Bernardakis reads μετὰ τῆς Ἄτης, which seems (Wyttenbach) to have slight authority; and again below λόγου περὶ Ἄτης καὶ ἡδονῆς from Duebner's conjecture. Ἄτη is however grotesquely out of place in this context. αὐτῆς is nothing in the world but a corruption of λύπης. Pleasure and pain were excluded from higher and purer regions and exist only on earth. The same corruption occurs elsewhere. In *Ar. Eth.* 9. 9. 1170^a 25 K^b has αὐτῆς for λύπης (Bywater, *Textual Crit.* p. 14). Dio Chrys. *de Concord.* 10 φέρει αὐτὴν καὶ φθόνον has been corrected by Wilamowitz to φέρει λύπην. Galen, quoting Posidonius, has ἄτης, *de Hipp. et Plat. plac.* 4. 7. p. 416, where, as many scholars have seen, λύπης must be restored. Read then μετὰ τῆς λύπης and περὶ λύπης καὶ ἡδονῆς.

401 F. συναγαγόντες ὅσον ἀργύριον.

The suggested ὅσιον ἀργύριον (Madvig) or ὅσον ἦν ὅσιον ἀργύριον would be a misuse of ὅσιον, for in such a case it means *profane*, the exact contrary of *sacred*. But it is likely enough that after the last letters of ἀργύριον the word ἱερόν has been lost, though it can hardly have stood alone without εἶχον or ἦν αὐτοῖς, or something similar.

404 C. δύνασθαι for δυναμένη?

407 D. πραγμάτων must have had some epithet or defining word attached

to it, e.g. *μεγάλων*, though probably not precisely that. *ὥσπερ τῷ Εὐριπίδῃ νομοθετοῦντι* should be corrected not to *τῷ Εὐ.* *ὥσπερ ν.*, but, by way of avoiding hiatus, to *ὥσπερ ν. τῷ Εὐ.*

409 F. *οὔτε γὰρ ἦν γαίης μέσος ὀμφαλὸς οὔδ' ἐθαλάσσης· εἰ δέ τις ἔστι, θεοῖς δῆλος, θνητοῖσι δ' ἄφαντος.*—Epimenides. The absence of any apparent reason for *ἦν* by the side of *ἔστι* suggests *οὐ τις ἄρ' ἦν*. But *ἦν* may possibly be the idiomatic 'philosophical' imperfect, as for instance Plato, *Rep.* 609 B, *τούτου ὀλεθρὸς οὐκ ἦν*. *οὔδ' ἐ* should probably be *οὔτε*.

410 A. *φιλοθεάμων* <ὦν>.

413 A. *θαυμαστὸν γὰρ ἔστιν κ.τ.λ.* is not an ironical statement, which would be feeble, but a question. Perhaps *γὰρ* should be *ἄρ'*. *καὶ τότε* should be, I think, *καὶ τοῦτο* rather than Madvig's *καὶ τότε*. The tense of *ἀπείρηκεν* shows that *τότε* cannot be right. Possibly *καὶ πρότερον*.

415 C. In Hesiod's lines

*τρεις δ' ἐλάφους ὁ κόραξ γηράσκειται·
αὐτὰρ ὁ φοῖνιξ
ἐννέα τοὺς κόρακας, δέκα δ' ἡμεῖς τοὺς
φοῖνικας,*

the two uses of *τοὺς* are almost certainly wrong (their force would be 'the crows with which the phoenix is coeval are ten in number'), but it is not easy to see where they came from or satisfactorily to alter them. Perhaps we need not assume that both represent the same word. Rzach's *ἐννέα μὲν κόρακας, δέκα φοῖνικας δέ τοι ἡμεῖς* does not commend itself, *μὲν* being much misplaced and *τοι* weak after *δή*. *δή* and *καί* would seem not unsuitable (*ἐννέα δὴ . . . καὶ φοῖνικας*).

424 B. *οὔδ' . . . οὔδ' ἐ*, not *οὔτε . . . οὔτε*.

439 E. *ὁ Ἀριστιππος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος 'πανταχοῦ σὺ ἄρ' εἰ;' γελάσας 'οὐκοῦν' ἔφη 'παραπόλλυμι τὸ ναῦλον, εἴ γε πανταχοῦ εἰμι.' τί οὖν οὐκ ἂν εἴποις καὶ αὐτὸς 'εἰ μὴ γίνονται μαθήσει βελτίονες ἄνθρωποι, παραπόλλυται ὁ μισθὸς τῶν παιδαγωγῶν';*

In the question and Aristippus' answer thus given there is no meaning, as far as I can see, nor is there any analogy in the use then made of the illustration. Something must be missing which corresponded to the *μή* . . .

βελτίονες of the other case. *πανταχοῦ σὺ <ὁ αὐτὸς> ἄρ' εἰ* would give a sense to the passage, but does not satisfy me, especially as *εἴ γε πανταχοῦ εἰμι* seems to need a similar insertion. One would like to connect the words with what Aristippus says in *Xen. Mem.* 2. 1. 13: *ξένος πανταχοῦ εἰμι*, but *ξένος* would not fit in here properly.

440 D. *περὶ τῆς ἠθικῆς λεγομένης καὶ δοκούσης, ἥ δὴ μάλιστα τῆς θεωρητικῆς διαφέρει, τῷ τὸ μὲν πάθος ὕλην ἔχειν τὸν δὲ λόγον εἶδος, εἰπεῖν πρόκειται κ.τ.λ.*

καὶ δοκούσης has here no meaning. Probably Plutarch wrote *καὶ δοκούσης τῷδε μάλιστα τῆς θεωρητικῆς διαφέρειν*, *τῷ κ.τ.λ.*, *τῷ κ.τ.λ.* explaining *τῷδε*.

442 A. *ἔξ <ἀρχῆς τοῦ κρατήσαντος> ἑαυτοῦ δεόμενοι? κρατεῖν* occurs just above.

479 C. *ζητοῦμεν ᾧ τὰ τοῦ βίου πιστεύομεν* would run a little better than *ᾧ πιστεύομεν τ.τ.β.*

481 C. *τὰ <μὲν> συμπαγέντα.*

481 F. *τὰ πλείστα φωρῶν αἰσχροὶ φωράσεις βροτῶν.*—Sophocles.

F. G. Schmidt doubted whether the error lay in *φωρῶν* or *φωράσεις*. The latter is perfectly proper here, while the former is misused. With *τὰ πλείστα* we want a word in the general sense of *examining* or *experiencing*, certainly not of *detecting*. He suggested *ἐφορῶν*. But, as *φωρῶν* is evidently a mere anticipation of *φωράσεις*, there is no need for the real word to resemble *φωρῶ* very closely in letters. Cf. on 500 A. and 528 F. I think there cannot be much doubt that it was *πειρῶν* *making trial*, which is fairly near.

483 E. *ἀνδραπόδου τιμὴν πλεονέχοντες.* Read *τιμῇ*, 'more by the price of a slave.'

493 B-E. This first chapter of *The Love of Offspring* is very faulty. In c *ζητεῖν ἐν ἱπποσιν καὶ κυσὶ καὶ ὄρνισι πῶς γαμοῦμεν αὐτοὶ καὶ γεννώμεν καὶ τεκνοτροφοῦμεν* requires *γαμῶμεν* and *τεκνοτροφῶμεν*, deliberative subjunctives. With *τὰ τῶν θηρίων κ.τ.λ.* the construction wholly breaks down. I conjecture that before *τὰ τῶν θ.* something is lost, e.g. *καὶ ἀναγκάζειν* or *ἀναγκάζοντας*, going on from *ζητεῖν* and governing what follows. *προσαγορεῦσαι* is unsuitable, and should be *προαγορεύσαι*. The sense will then be 'causing animals to pro-

claim and attest a great departure on our part from what is natural.'

Ten lines below read <δι> ἐτέρων ὄρεξιν.

τοῖς δὲ ζῴοις τὸ μὲν πραύτροπον τοῦ λόγου καὶ περιττὸν καὶ φιλελεύθερον ἄγαν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλόγους δ' ὁρμὰς καὶ ὀρέξεις ἔχοντα καὶ χρώμενα πλάναις καὶ περιδρομαῖς πολλάκις οὐ μακρὰν ἀλλ' ὥς ἐπ' ἀγκύρας τῆς φύσεως σαλεύει· καθάπερ οὖν ὁδὸν ὑφ' ἡνία καὶ χαλινῷ βαδίζοντα δεικνύειν εὐθεῖαν.

πραύτροπον gives a quite inappropriate meaning and does not harmonise at all with περιττὸν and φιλελεύθερον. What we want is the idea of licence and extravagance. τὸ παράτροπον τοῦ λόγου would seem to be what Plutarch wrote: not departure from reason, but the distorted, extravagant forms of reason itself. So he writes in the next sentence ὁ δὲ δεσπότης ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ αὐτοκρατῆς λόγος ἄλλας ἄλλοτε παρεκβάσεις καὶ καινοτομίας ἱνευρίσκων κ.τ.λ., where the παρεκβάσεις on reason's part answer exactly to τὸ παράτροπον τοῦ λόγου.

Plutarch has παρατρέπω and παρατροπή fairly often, παράτροπος in *Ly-sander* 12.

After οὐ μακρὰν a verb (*departs, diverges*) has dropped out. σαλεύει does not suit it, and zeugma is unlikely. The last words have got out of order. ὁδὸν οὖν καθάπερ for καθάπερ οὖν ὁδὸν would put it right.

497 B. οὐχ ὁμοίους, not οὐχ ὁμοίως.

498 C. τριβόμενος ἐν τισιν ἐλπίσιν.

Is not an adjective missing before τισίν? τις with an adjective is very familiar, while τισίν alone here seems needless and weak.

499 A. Τύχη, | πενίαν ἀπειλεῖς; καταγελαῖ σου Μητροκλῆς has all the appearance of verse.

Ib. E. ἐὰν τετρωμένοις ἐπεισενεχθῇ μόνον, εὐθὺς ἀπόλλυσι τῷ προσπεπονθότι καὶ τὴν ἀπορροὴν δεχομένῳ.

Read προσπεπονθότι. προσπάσχω is out of place, whereas προσ. suits τετρωμένοις exactly. προσ- and προ- above in 493 B-E.

500 A. ποιεῖ, which is evidently wrong, comes from ποιήσῃ in the line before. Cf. on 481 E. The real word therefore may have been very different.

513 A. Read δέξονται for δέχονται.

525 A. Ἀπολλων, ἀνθρώπων τίν' ἀθλιώτερον | ἐόρακας ἢ ἐρώντα δυσποτμώτερον;—Menander?

Bernardakis gives ἢ without comment, though it does not scan. Other edd. have ἀρ', and it is not apparent what the evidence is. I do not see any sufficient reason for thinking that these two lines must belong to the same passage as that from which Plutarch has quoted just before, and ἐρώντα is entirely out of keeping with the immediate context, where he is speaking of the troubles of a parsimonious householder, not of a lover. ἢ γέροντα would to my mind be more in place.

525 E. Perhaps σταντὸν στροβεῖς, | κοχλίου βίον ζῶν.

528 B. μεταμφιευνούσι πάντας?

Ib. F. As far as I can make out, ὅψιν in Bernardakis' text is an error of the press for ἦπτον. It would be due to ὄψεως occurring just before, and well illustrates the tendency to repetition of a word which I have assumed above on 481 E and 500 A.

529 C. προσαγάγῃ should be προσάγῃ, 'when he is applying it.'

536 A. πεισθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπαινούντων ὡς μόνους ἄνδρας καὶ μόνους ἀκολακεύτους καὶ νῆ Δία στόματα καὶ φωνὰς προσαγορευόντων.

What is there in στόματα καὶ φωνὰς to call for the exclamation νῆ Δία? Read γνήσια or ἀληθινὰ στόματα καὶ φωνὰς, genuine, sincere voices.

537 E. ἀνάγκη τοίνυν <ἐνεῖναι> or <ἐργίνεσθαι> τὰ πάθη ταῦτα τοῖς αὐτοῖς?

548 B. καθάπερ παρόντος καὶ μὴ παρόντος is another instance of inadvertent repetition. Read (say) μὴ ἀπελθόντος. ὥχετ' ἀπιών is used above.

551 E. τρόπος ὀνομάσθη <διὰ> τὸ μεταβάλλον αὐτοῦ? Cf. on 493 B-E. Character itself, not the mutability of character, got the name of τρόπος. Then <ὅτι> ὡς with Reiske.

554 F. τὸ συνειδὸς (conscience) ἐγκείμενον ἔχων καὶ ἀπότινον.

Bernardakis παρατεῖνον: Wytténbach once ἀποτεῖνον. Surely ἀποτινόμενον.

555 D. εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο φαίη τις ἂν ἐν τῷ βίῳ καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τῶν πονηρῶν ὑπάρχειν κακόν, ἀλλά . . . ἢ αἰσθησις αὐτῶν ἀνατρέπει τὴν ψυχὴν.

τῷ χρόνῳ means nothing at all. The word has been confused with τρόπῳ, *their life and character*. See my *Aristotelica*, index s.v. χρόνος.

557 F. εἰς παραμυθίαν <χρήσιμον> ἀφέλειν? ἀφέλειν <ἀφέλει>?

560 C. After ἐφημέρους ψυχάς add something in the sense of ἐχόντων. Like ἐχόντων above, it will agree with ἡμῶν.

562 A. Perhaps <ὥστε>, ὡς οὐ κ.τ.λ., ὥστε governing ἄγειν.

574 A. ταῦτα δ' <ὥς> ἀληθῆ . . . φανερά μοι δοκεῖ μαρτύρια εἶναι κ.τ.λ.

575 C. For τοῦ δὲ ταῖς αἰτίαις read ἐν δὲ ταῖς αἰτίαις. The αἰτίαι are, I suppose, the causes of the τέλος, i.e. the details (τὰ ἐπὶ μέρους) of the development from which the τέλος finally emerged.

565 D. φιληδονίας εἶδος is a puzzling expression, and Bernardakis' ἥλος from

718 D quite unsuitable, I am afraid, to the verb ἐξηνεγκε. I can suggest nothing better than πάθος. πάθος and ἦθος, ἦθος and εἶδος sometimes get confused.

582 A. οὐδεμιᾶς γὰρ τέχνης <ἐμπείροις>? Cf. ἄπειρος following.

586 A. εὐρεῖαι μὲν γὰρ ἀτραποὶ βίων, ὀλίγαι δ' ἄς δαίμονες ἀνθρώπους ἄγουσιν.

It is perhaps rather the characteristic of an ἀτραπὸς not to be wide; but in any case, the antithesis here presented is a very odd one. When we consider that the natural opposite of *few* is *many*, we have little difficulty in seeing that εὐρεῖαι is a mistake for μυρίαί, *infinite in number*, made easier by ν ending the word before it.

594 F. ἔσομαι, not ἔπομαι.

602 B. ὅσων <ἥκιστα> δεῖ? This is only a variation on Cobet's οὐ.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

THE PROBABLE ERROR OF A WATER-CLOCK.

IN the *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* for March, 1915, Miss Longbottom and I have discussed the Secular Acceleration of the Moon's Mean Motion as determined from the Occultations in the *Almagest*. It is not to be expected that many classical scholars will be interested either in the contents of *Monthly Notices* or in the Moon's acceleration, but as our study has a bearing on the errors of the instrument by means of which the observations in question appear to have been timed, I have thought it desirable to throw some of my conclusions into a separate paper for the benefit of anyone who may be interested in ancient time-keeping.

It may be well to explain at the beginning that this discussion is not concerned with the errors of the best constructed water-clocks, but with the errors of the clocks actually used by astronomical observers; further, it is not concerned with the time as ascertained from the clocks by the most rigorous methods, but with the time ascertained from the clocks by the method actually used; it will probably be not unreasonable to suppose that the

clocks and the methods used by the astronomers were at least as accurate as those used by ordinary people.

In the third chapter of the seventh book of the *Almagest* Ptolemy cites seven observations of occultations of stars by the Moon, or conjunctions of stars with the Moon. I append the Julian date, local mean time, name of observer, and place of observation of each:

Date.	Time.	Observer.	Place.
I. B.C. 295, Dec. 21	3.30 a.m.	Timocharis	Alexandria
II. „ 294, Mar. 9	8.15 p.m.	Timocharis	Alexandria
III. „ 283, Jan. 29	8.43 p.m.	Timocharis	Alexandria
IV. „ 283, Nov. 9	3.38 a.m.	Timocharis	Alexandria
V. A.D. 92, Nov. 29	7.14 p.m.	Agrippa	Bithynia
VI. „ 98, Jan. 11	{ 5.6 a.m. 6.7 a.m.	Menelaus	Rome
VII. „ 98, Jan. 14	6.6 a.m.	Menelaus	Rome

The sixth observation was made in two stages separated by about an hour.

The method by which the time was determined is not stated, but the time is on each occasion expressed in 'seasonal' hours ((ὥραι καίρικαί), each of which comprises one-twelfth of the

interval from sunset to sunrise for the particular night, and it is well known that the ancient water-clocks were constructed so as to indicate such hours. Each hour is divided into three parts, and the time is given to the nearest third of an hour. Had the time been determined by meridian observations, it would have been a waste of labour to reduce it to 'seasonal' hours.

There is then ground for an *à priori* assumption that the observations were timed by water-clocks. This will be confirmed by an investigation of the errors of the individual observations. The errors of a water-clock are either (a) constant, increasing in direct proportion to the lapse of time, or (b) variable, acting independently of the lapse of time. A nocturnal observer had two points of time given directly by observation by means of which he could check his clock, namely, sunset with which the first hour ought to begin, and sunrise with which the last hour ought to end. If the clock was working the whole night, the observer could compare the time of observation with either of these, or, if he were so inclined, he could correct the mean length of the hour by observing the difference between twelve hours and the interval between sunset and sunrise as recorded by his clock, and he could thus eliminate the whole of the constant error and a part of the variable error.

In discussing the observations, we assumed that all the elements that enter into the astronomical computation, with the single exception of the secular acceleration of the Moon's mean motion, are sufficiently determined for our purpose by modern astronomy, and I therefore weighted the different observations in proportion to the probable error of the secular acceleration as determined from them. Here it may be explained that when it is an even chance whether an error exceeds or falls short of a given quantity, that quantity is called the probable error. In order to do this I needed to have a theory of the errors to which a water-clock is liable, and I selected the theory which appeared to me the most probable, which happens also to be the theory which reduces the discordances to a minimum. It will be observed

that not one of the seven observations was made within three and a quarter hours of midnight. The observers were, apparently, unwilling to sacrifice any large part of the night's sleep to the cause of science. It would be unnecessary to set the clock going at sunset in order to make observations at 3.30 a.m. or later, and for ought that we know it might be necessary to keep a series of attendants up to regulate the water-supply if the clock were kept going all night; moreover, the accumulated errors would vitiate the morning observations. I therefore assumed that the evening observations were compared with sunset only, and the morning observations with sunrise only. It also seemed to me that the constant error was likely to be much larger than the variable error, and I therefore treated the latter as negligible, and weighted the observations for a probable error in the time bearing a constant ratio on each night to the interval separating the observation from the sunset or sunrise with which it was supposed to be compared. I assumed that the ratio of the rate of error on one night to the rate of error on another night was purely accidental. In this way I found the data for a least squares solution and obtained a value for the secular acceleration and its probable error.

In the paper in *Monthly Notices* solutions are given for two theories in addition to the one adopted. I have since worked out the problem on three other theories. It is manifest that any investigation of the probable errors of a water-clock in the light of the occultations is valueless, if a theory which regards all the errors as purely casual gives as good a result. I therefore form Theory I. according to which errors of an equal amount are equally probable at all hours of the night. Theory II. assumes that the time shown by the clock was corrected so as to give to each hour its average length for the particular night. This, as has been seen above, is the most rigorous method of determining the time by a water-clock. Theory III. assumes that the constant error is negligible, but that there is a variable error, and that the observed time is always compared with sunset, so that the morning observations are

affected by the large net error which has arisen during the night. Theory IV. also assumes that the constant error is negligible, but supposes that the morning observations are compared with sunrise and that the net error is reduced accordingly. Theory V. regards the variable error as negligible, but assumes a constant error accumulating from sunset, while Theory VI., which I adopt, also regards the variable error as negligible, and, as has been seen above, assumes that the morning observations are compared with sunrise, and the evening observations with sunset. Of the six theories all but II. and V. give the same value for the secular acceleration, but with different probable errors. The probable errors of the resultant secular acceleration as worked out by the different theories were found to be as follows:

Theory.	Probable Error in Acceleration.	Theory.	Probable Error in Acceleration.
I.	$\pm 0''\cdot90$	IV.	$\pm 0''\cdot80$
II.	$\pm 0''\cdot85$	V.	$\pm 0''\cdot78$
III.	$\pm 0''\cdot82$	VI.	$\pm 0''\cdot70$

It will be observed that any theory which assumes that the times were determined by a water-clock is superior to Theory I., which ignores the water-clock, while the adopted theory, which seemed intrinsically the most probable, gives a far less discordant result than any of the others. V. and VI. which treat the variable error as negligible work out better than II., III., and IV., which assume that the constant error was either negligible or capable of being eliminated. I have not thought it desirable to investigate for two unknown causes of error. It is clear from the investigation that the constant error was far more important than the variable, and any value found for the latter from so short a series of observations would be artificial.

The probable error discovered on the adopted theory is equivalent to a probable error of twelve minutes per hour, so that the probable error of a clock time two hours from comparison with observed time would be twenty-four minutes. It makes no difference whether this is expressed in 'seasonal'

or in equinoctial time, such as we use. The probable rate of error is twelve seasonal minutes in a seasonal hour, twelve equinoctial minutes in an equinoctial hour.

It must be remembered that half the actual errors should according to theory exceed the probable error, and not a few should be double the probable error. In the present series in four out of seven observations, the actual error appears to exceed the probable error, and in two of these four cases it is just over double the probable error. We must therefore regard an error of twenty-four minutes an hour as something not uncommon. From this it follows that water-clocks, as they were used by the astronomers whose observations have been under discussion, would be of little value except within a few hours of the phenomenon with which the clock-time was compared. In the first observation, the most discordant of the series, this interval has its highest value, about three hours and a half, giving a probable error of 42 minutes. From this it follows further that the clock would be of very little use in the early morning in order to determine the time for any immediate action, but only for observations, the time of which could not be determined till the sun had risen. It might equalise military watches at night, but left it quite uncertain what relation the end of the last watch would bear to sunrise, while it would be of little use as a guide to the beginning of an action which was to reach a definite stage before dawn. In fact on any morning in which the stars were visible, a military commander would find it better to look for some star which had recently risen heliacally and was still a harbinger of dawn than to trust a water-clock.

By day the clock could probably be checked by noon as well as by sunrise and sunset, but it would at best be a poor substitute for the sun-dial, and would clearly be more useful for marking short intervals as in the law-courts than for determining the time of day. I for one never realised before I entered upon this study how much we owe to the inventors of mechanical clocks.

J. K. FOTHERINGHAM,

NOTES

HERODOTUS AND BABYLON

(See pp. 169, 223).

I HAVE to thank the Warden of Wadham for many kind words about my book on *Ancient Town-planning*. But he has done a small injustice to Weissbach which, quite apart from being that, threatens to obscure the general problem. Weissbach's *Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* was necessarily limited to such 'reconstruction' as was possible in 1904. The river-wall was then untraced; its existence was merely presumed. Therefore its line could not be laid down on a plan. But this is quite a different thing from suggesting that the river-front was unwallled. Weissbach omitted a line which he could not show definitely. Indeed, if he were writing to-day, when we have actual proof of a part of the wall, he would still have to omit much of it, because its course is still largely undetermined. If the Warden himself (say, in a new edition of his excellent commentary) issued a plan of Babylon, he too would have to omit much of this wall; he would show a fragment 'beginning and ending in the air.' Similarly, Weissbach omitted all the dwelling-houses of Babylon, not because he thought that Babylon contained no inhabitants, but because the dwelling-houses were, in 1904, and indeed still are, imperfectly known.

I wish to make this clear, partly because the criticism brought against Weissbach applies—or, rather, does not apply—equally to all recent plans of Babylon, but chiefly because the suggestion which I based on those plans seems to offer some chance of making progress with the problem of Herodotean Babylon. Hitherto we have had two groups of theories. Some scholars, like Oppert and Baumstark, tried to

force the remains into harmony with the dimensions of the city as given in literature. The Warden and (I think) all recent writers have rejected this view; they have adopted instead a 'non possumus' position. Either, like most of the archaeologists and assyriologists, they declare that Herodotus is altogether wrong, and that nothing really useful can be made out of him, or, as the Warden seems to do, they stick up for Herodotus, and are a little scornful about attempts to interpret the excavations. If, however, we can find—in the fairly certain half-square and the other, not certain, half-square of remains, with the river dividing the two diagonally—an important feature in which Herodotus and archaeological facts meet, there is chance of reconciliation. No doubt the remains are much smaller than either Herodotus or any other ancient writer implies. But the dimensions given by Herodotus are admittedly incredible; practically no one now attempts to defend them. It is, indeed, a recognised truth that large figures are the most unreliable items in narratives, whether of the ancient or the medieval or even of the present world.

F. HAVERFIELD.

LIVY I. 34. 1.

THE texts give *Lucumo . . . Romam commigravit cupidine maxime ac spe magni honoris*.

I would suggest that *maxime* (which gives no good sense) is corrupt, and that what Livy wrote was *maximi*, meaning by '*cupidine maximi ac spe magni honoris*' that Lucumo wanted to become king, and was confident that he would attain some high position in any event.

M. T. TATHAM.

REVIEWS

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS.

Livy, Book III., ed. by P. Thoresby Jones. (Clarendon Press; with vocabulary, 3s. 6d.; without, 2s. 6d.). This is a useful edition, especially for those who have not done much continuous reading of *Livy*. We have an Introduction (32 pp.) specially good on the history and constitution of early Rome, the Oxford text by Conway and Walters (74 pp.), Notes (98 pp.), Vocabulary (78 pp.). The editor is good at 'spotting' the points which are likely to cause difficulty to the fifth form boy, and explaining them clearly and briefly. He is always scholarly, though sometimes his generalisations as to Latin usage seem to us a little too sweeping. For instance, we doubt if it is true, though it is often stated, that expressions like *interficiendorum tribunorum* are 'usually avoided for reasons of euphony.' Cicero, who had a tolerable ear, has plenty of examples, and he is not alone; so far from avoiding two *-orum* endings he seems to have had a liking for three, as in *Catil. i. 7 tuorum consiliorum reprimendorum causa*. Whether it is desirable to have special vocabularies in books intended for those who are beginning to be able to use a large dictionary is doubtful; it is certainly convenient for the day-boy who cannot carry a number of large books about. It is worth noting that the vocabulary to this book is remarkably well made.

Rather fuller notes are given in S. G. Campbell's edition of *Livy*, Book XXVII. (Pitt Press, 3s.; Historical Introduction, with Table showing the distribution of the legions 210 B.C. to 207 B.C., 20 pp.; Text, 75 pp.; Notes and Index, 142 pp.). The edition is a good one for a student who has only read one or two books of *Livy*; both subject-matter and language are treated with care and thoroughness. The notes on grammatical questions often run to some length, and should interest the more intelligent reader in the Latin language. We venture to call atten-

tion to a small point on which Mr. Campbell follows a traditional 'rule' which has been shown to be untrue. In his note on *i4, 5*, speaking of 'the common attraction of the subject pronoun to the gender of the predicate *hic labor est* "this is toil,"' he states that 'the Romans . . . do not say *hic non est labor*' for 'this is not toil.' Yet Cicero writes (*Phil. i, 37*) *non plausum illum, sed iudicium puto* and (*Nat. d. i, 122*) *non erit ista amicitia, sed mercatura*. Lebreton (*Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron*, pp. 24-29) says that there is only one negative sentence in Cicero in which the (neuter) pronoun is not thus attracted, namely *Sex. Rosc. i06*. Lebreton concludes his study of the subject thus: 'Si l'on remarque que c'est sur ce seul passage de Cicéron que s'appuyait la règle donnée par les grammairiens jusqu'à Riemann, on constatera que, sur ce point encore, la généralisation avait été un peu hâtive.'

Thucydides, Book VI., ed. by C. F. Smith. (Ginn, College Series, 250 pp., 6s. 6d.). If anyone wants to read Greek comfortably we commend to him the books in this series. The fine large type of the text and the presence of the notes on the same page make them very easy to use. The book before us is based on the Classen-Steup edition (1905), the notes of which 'have been followed for the most part, but with a more independent attitude than was maintained in Books III. and VII.' Various other commentaries have been regularly consulted and those of Marchant and of Spratt, 'which have been at hand in the last stages of the work, would have proved more helpful had they been always consulted from the outset.' The notes are good and clear; they give the sort of help that a sixth form boy or more mature scholar is likely to need. The book would be more generally useful if references were given, not to German, but to English books and periodicals on history, antiquities, etc. For instance, if one is interested

in the topography of Athens, it is annoying to be referred to a paper by Curtius (dated 1854) and other German works which are not accessible to most of us. What one wants is, first, an indication of the best discussion of the matter in English, and, secondly, a note of any recent foreign work in which further information can be found.

Mr. O. R. A. Byrde, who edits the *Heracles* (Clarendon Press, 2s. 6d.), is evidently thoroughly interested in Euripides. His Introduction (13 pp.) is excellent. Many of the notes (52 pp.) are good, but there is much need of revision. Some of them are not easy to understand, either because they are unduly compressed or because they are carelessly drafted. We doubt the value of the elaborate set of indexes (9 pp.). As these things tend to raise the price of school books it is worth while to say a word about them. Our experience is (1) that an index verborum is always useful because it helps one to find a passage of which one recalls but a few words, (2) that an index of grammatical notes or of passages referred to is of no value except in a book in which grammatical questions are treated more fully than in the ordinary reference books. It is difficult to see how the list of proper names which happen to be mentioned in the notes can be of service; e.g. can it be worth while to record the numerous places where *Heracles* is mentioned?

The *Apology of Socrates*, ed. by A. M. Adam (Cambridge Elementary Classics, University Press, 2s. 6d.). The *Apology* is one of the best books for those who are beginning to read a Greek author unabridged, provided they are old enough to appreciate the thought. One can read it slowly without losing interest, and the frequent repetition of the same words and constructions encourages the student to feel that he is growing quite at home in Greek. Mrs. Adam has produced an admirable edition, because she has kept steadily in mind the needs of the intelligent, grown-up beginner. Her notes are simple, scholarly, clear. They are based on those of Dr. Adam, but they 'have been for the most part,

and the introduction entirely, rewritten.' Mr. H. Williamson's excellent edition in Macmillan's Classical Series has also been used. The vocabulary is good, and is quite as useful as the small L. and S. at this stage.

Odyssey VI. and VII., ed. by G. M. Edwards (same series, 2s.), is good in the same way as an introduction to Homer. The editor follows the good old plan of printing below the text the ordinary Greek forms corresponding to any epic words which are likely to give trouble—e.g., ἵμεν] ἱέναι. It would probably help the beginner if a few pages were added summarising the more important facts of accidence and syntax. The literary side is emphasised by occasional quotation from the translations of Mackail or Butcher and Lang. We often see in elementary books made up illustrations which we should hesitate to put in our pupils' hands, for fear of giving them a wrong impression of ancient life. But here we have some excellent reproductions of Greek vase paintings, which show us how some Greeks pictured the meeting of Odysseus and Nausicaa, and similar scenes. We should be still more pleased if a note were added to tell us the approximate date of the vases and a little more about them. Some students need to be told that the vase-painter has an artistic aim, and is not trying to make a realistic picture of an actual scene.

Less successful, in our opinion, is A. G. Peskett's edition of *De Bello Civili*, Book II. (Pitt Press Series, 2s. 6d.), because the editor has a less definite idea of the needs of his readers. Sometimes he thinks of them as beginners who will need a simple vocabulary in which to look up *audio* and *magnus*, sometimes as capable of understanding and appreciating the historical value of a quotation from Dion, and of being interested in the statement that 'Draeger, *Hist. Synt.* (1878) omits *praetermitto* in his account of the compounds of *mitto*.' But, for all that, the edition will be useful. The editor knows Caesar well, and his notes are trustworthy. We wish he had made them rather fuller. For instance, it

does not seem satisfactory to say, on 17, 2, *haec omnibus ferebat sermonibus 'ferebat, "gave out"'*. The student should be enabled to form some idea how it comes to mean that. Meusel quotes Livy, 4, 5, 6, *ferte sermonibus et multiplicata fama bella*. Still more desirable is it to expand the brief Introduction (just over three pages). A student who has not recently read Book I. will not easily realise how the campaigns in different parts of the world are related to one another. It would be well, too, to tell him in what *English* books he will find good accounts of the war, of the Roman army, etc. Drumann-Grübe is not accessible to most of those for whom this book is intended.

A similar remark may be made about G. B. Allen's *Selected Letters of Pliny* (Clarendon Press, 2s. 6d.). Here is a selection definitely intended for candidates for Pass Moderations. They are referred to an article by Stobbe in *Philologus*, 'Zur Chronologie der Briefe des Plinius,' to Friedländer's *Sitten-geschichte* (not the English version), and Marquardt's *Privatleben*, but they are not told what are the best books in English on the history and antiquities of the period. It is well worth while to name a good many and to make the advice as definite as possible, for the Pass Moderations student is not good at finding his way unaided in the *Dictionary of Antiquities* and similar works. The Letters (53 pp.) are well chosen, and the Introduction (36 pp.) and Notes (54 pp.) give suitable help. We think there are too many notes of the type 'for *quamquam* with participle and abl. abs. cf. x. 33. 1.' Would it not be better to say 'So in x. 33. 1. *quamquam via interiacente*'? It takes no more space and saves time. There are several notes referring to passages in which this use of *quamquam* may be found. We doubt if students hunt them up and learn from them anything about the syntax of the participle. It would be better, instead of this scattered treatment, to give a fuller note in one place, quoting a few sentences and showing how *quamquam* came to be felt necessary.

Intermediate Oral Latin Reader, by Frank Jones (Blackie, 2s., 115 pp.), consists of an abridgment of Cicero's *De Senectute* (46 pp.), selections from Martial (14 pp.) and from Horace (7 pp.). Each chapter of the Cicero is preceded by short sentences, in which the difficulties are presented in a somewhat simpler form. After each chapter comes an Interrogatio. It is a good idea to give occasionally Latin foot-notes; they often supply just the help required, and tempt the pupil to believe that he can read Latin. The pictures are well chosen, and are made more helpful by short notes. Mr. Jones is evidently a good scholar and a skilful teacher.

Noctes Latinae, by W. Madeley (Macmillan, 1s. 6d., 166 pp.). Ten stories, with short and sensible notes. Neither in the text nor in the vocabulary are the quantities marked, so that the reader when he meets a new word, and he will meet many, will have no guide to the pronunciation. The purpose of the book is to provide 'boys of about thirteen with a translation book in which they can be interested.' We have, for instance, Androcles and Arion from Gellius, Damocles from Cicero, an original story based on the *Menaechni* of Plautus, and even the Matrona Ephesia from Petronius. The last named, even when bowdlerised, seems to us not wholly suitable reading for boys of thirteen. The editor thinks that boys will like these tales better than Caesar and Vergil. Our own belief is that they will like them for a change, but that they ought to be made a good deal easier, both in vocabulary and sentence structure—this book is quite as hard as Caesar—so that a story may be read rapidly and with little help. For everyday work we think they would prefer, say, the defence of Cicero's camp, and the rest of Book V. of the *Bell. Gall.*, or the sack of Troy, to a series of disconnected tales.

Miss Ryle's *Olim* (Bell, 1s., 53 pp.) is an excellent piece of work. It consists of half a dozen plays or dialogues intended for classroom acting. Thus we have a talk between Catullus and

Lesbia preparing the way for the *Passer* poem; a conversation about the weather leads up to the recitation by one of the characters of Vergil's *Nunquam imprudentibus imber Obfuit* (*Georg.* i, 373 ff.). Probably the most popular, especially with girls, will be *Lex Oppia*, in which the women of Rome insist on the repeal of the sumptuary law. Here are a few lines from the last scene: A. *Vincula non timemus.* B. *Immo vero, vinculis nos*

ipsas ad postes vestros ligabimus ne quis nos abducere possit. C. *Omnes tabellarios opperiemur, qui litteras . . .* C. *Catonem superavimus mulieres.* D. *Fortasse aliquando etiam suffragii ius nobis permittetur.* In this we have perhaps some slightly modern touches, but we commend the writer because she has tried to put real Romans on her stage and not moderns dressed up in Roman clothes. Σ.

MÜLLER'S AESTHETIC COMMENTARY ON SOPHOCLES.

Ästhetischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien des Sophokles. By ADOLF MÜLLER, Professor an der Gelehrten-schule zu Kiel. 1 vol. Pp. 526. 1 Photogravure. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh. M. 6.60.

THIS work, which is a second and enlarged edition of one produced in 1904, is called an *Aesthetic Commentary on Sophocles*, but is rather a systematic treatment of the *Realien* of the plays. It covers a great deal more than merely aesthetic considerations: it comments on scenes and character rather than on individual lines. It cannot be hailed as light reading, for it contains 526 pages of closely printed matter, and the author is prolix and often irrelevant, and, although the book contains much useful and interesting information, the table of contents is not nearly detailed enough to make a serviceable guide, and there are no headings of pages and paragraphs.

The plan of the book is as follows: A preliminary essay of fifty pages gives an account of Sophocles, the national and patriotic poet, favoured by gods and comic writers, the man who was a consummate artist, but not very inventive and not speculative; he is considered in relation to the events of his age, and the special characteristics of his style are analysed. Then follows a description of his plays *seriatim*; they are all examined in accordance with one plan—(1) the Saga in Greek literature and art; (2) preliminary considerations on the play; (3) the story up to the commencement of the play; (4) the argument; (5) the analysis of

each scene and chorus; (6) the lines of treatment, in which the exposition, climax, and conclusion of the play are indicated, with the different stages of the dramatic movement; (7) consideration of points of dramatic and ethical signification. For instance, in the *Antigone* there are discussed the question of the two burials, the attitude of ancient literature to love, the genuineness of Antigone's disputed speech, the order of Creon's execution of the duties imposed on him by Teiresias, the part played by the Chorus, and the motive of the entrance or exit of particular characters. To this last point in all the plays Professor Müller pays especial attention.

The characters are treated separately, and it is here that the Professor's verbosity is most marked. He has nothing of the gift, ascribed to the dramatist whom he expounds, of making a character vivid by half a line. His analyses are lengthy, but lack subtlety; perhaps the character of Tecmessa is described with most sympathy and understanding. He is apt to indulge in rhetoric, and at times to be very irrelevant. Thus in the analysis of Philoctetes' character we have a lengthy catalogue of the discomforts suffered on Lemnos, and, while treating of Deianira's character, he gives us a comparison of the *Agamemnon* and *Trachiniae*, which is based on such Monmouth-Macedon resemblances as the fact that a cloak plays a part in the death both of Heracles and Agamemnon.

There follow certain general considerations on the structure and setting of Greek tragedies, with separate articles

on the dialogue, chorus, etc. An account of Greek music is interrupted by an irrelevant panegyric on the music of his own countrymen and a speculation on the reasons why the North of Germany is less musical than the South. The research recently made into the earliest origins of Tragedy is treated somewhat sketchily in relation to the bulk of the whole work; stage arrangements and mechanism are considered, and attention is paid to the theories of Bethe, Wieseler, and Dörpfeld.

We were told recently that a German savant need have no more than half a shelf of English books, so trivial have been the contributions of our countrymen to learning. It is to be observed that in his half-shelf Professor Müller has a well-thumbed Shakespeare, but of English scholarship he professes but slight acquaintance. Two references are made to Jebb, both in connection with the same scene in the *Antigone*. Dr. Rouse's theory of the burial by

Ismene is dismissed as incredible, and Professor Ridgeway is once referred to as being wrong in a chapter, which, whether directly or indirectly, seems to owe not a little to his speculations. That is all.

Professor Müller has collected much that is useful. His analysis of dramatic technique is sound; no part of the book is more satisfactory than his treatment of such questions as the motives for the entrance and exits of characters, such as the apparently purposeless entrance of Creon in *Ant.* 882 (there is a misprint in Müller's reference). The chapter on dialogue, with its analysis of stichomythia and symmetrical verse-groups in tragedy, is one of the best in the book. But if the whole work were compressed, it would be of greater value. Where a love of beauty is to be encouraged, there, if anywhere, a writer should keep in mind μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

THE OXFORD ARISTOTLE IN ENGLISH.

The Works of Aristotle translated into English: *de Mundo, de Spiritu*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2s. net.

THESE translations (together with the *Parva Naturalia* already published) are the first instalments of Vol. III. of the *Oxford Aristotle in English*. Mr. E. S. Forster is responsible for the *de Mundo*, Mr. J. F. Dobson for the *de Spiritu*. The *de Mundo*, addressed to Alexander, is as the translator says 'an interesting little treatise,' and one that has been the subject of much discussion because of the mystery of its authorship and date. In Zeller's *Eclectics* (Eng. tr. c. 5) the student will find an examination of some current views on the treatise; and besides this there is the later and more elaborate essay by Capelle in *Neue Jahrbücher* XV., to which reference is made in Mr. Forster's Preface. The translation follows Bekker's text with a few variations recorded in the foot-notes, and the passages which seem open to doubt on the score either

of text or interpretation are but few. In 391^b 10 ff. the reading of Capelle ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ θεόν is approved, in place of the plurals θεῶν given by Bekker: this may be right, but is it right to render it 'preserved by and through God'? Again, at 392^b 8, it seems doubtful whether the view adopted is the best: I should have thought that ἐκείνης, alluding ultimately to αἰθέρος, was a likelier reading than κινήσεως. In 394^b 36 there is mention of a wind that 'follows a bending course' called 'Caecias': here, too (as at 391 above), I should be inclined to read 'Circias,' because of the etymological suggestion of 'circularity.' In the note on ὁρωμένον, in the sense of 'heard' (395^a 18), a reference might have been added to the well-known Aeschylean κτύπον δέδορκα. The rendering of the words περαίνεται δὲ καὶ ὁ μῦθος οὐκ ἀτάκτως 401^b 23, viz. 'this fable is well and duly composed,' fails to bring out the full force of περαίνεται, with its echo of the preceding συμπεραίνουσα (cf. the

περαίνει 4 ll. *infra*), and slurs over the *καί* to boot.

The *de Spiritu*, like the *de Mundo*, is a spurious production, and, as Mr. Dobson justly observes in his Preface, 'No amount of emendation will remove the incoherence of the work, which must be regarded rather as a collection of Problems than as a finished treatise.' The translation is adapted to the new Teubner text of Jaeger, though in several cases dissent from Jaeger is recorded in the foot-notes, and occasionally new conjectures are adopted. At 483^b 23 ff. the translation runs: 'It is also proved both by dissection and by the fact that the veins and air-ducts . . . connect with the intestines and the belly,' with the foot-note 'Here again there seems to be a dislocation, for it is not clear what is proved by dissection.' The Greek (Bekker) is: *φανερὸν δ' ἔκ τε τῶν ἀνατομῶν εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἔντερον . . . αἱ ἀρτηρίαι συνάπτουσιν, κ.τ.λ.* Why not excise the *καί*, together with the preceding comma, so that the sense is 'dissections prove the connection between veins and belly,' etc.? Another place where the rendering seems open to doubt is 484^b 38 ff.—'for perhaps some, *e.g.* the spine, have little or no function except that of bending . . . others are bound together by sinews.' The Greek runs: *ἐνίοις γὰρ ἴσως οὐδὲν ἢ ἐπ' ὀλίγον, οἷον ἢ ῥάχιν· ἄλλ' ἢ κάμψιν . . . τὰ δὲ καὶ συνδέεται νεύροις, κ.τ.λ.*, except that Mr. Dobson corrects *ἀλλ' ἢ* to *ἀλλ' ἢ*. Where, then, does Mr. Dobson get his 'function' from? For it looks from the context as if the sentence ought to run 'some have little or no need'—*viz.* of sinews for connecting purposes. *ἀλλ' ἢ κάμψιν* is difficult, but by a slight correction, reading *ἀλλ' ἢ κάμψει*, we can get the meaning which, I take it, is required, *viz.* 'except for the purpose of bending.' Further, the translation entirely skips the *καί* in the last clause, which seems to mean 'also,' as if the connection was by sinews as well as by serum; while, if that is an impossible sense, we should like to know what the translator makes of it. Of the new readings adopted, that by Mr. W. D. Ross (485^b 27), *λίαν ἀπλῶς . . . <ἐπεὶ> εἵπερ* (for *αἰτίαν ἀπλῶς*) strikes one as specially neat

and attractive. By way of general commendation, it is needless to say more than that the translations of both these treatises are well up to the high standard already set in the earlier sections of the Oxford Aristotle.

R. G. BURY.

The Works of Aristotle. Translated into English. *De Coloribus. De Audibilibus. Physiognomonica. De Plantis. Mechanica. Ventorum Situs et Cognomina. De Melisso, Xenophane, Gorgia.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913. Price 5s. net.

THE present volume consists of translations of the above-mentioned short treatises which, though they have been ascribed to Aristotle, are all of them almost certainly the work of other and later authors. Some (or perhaps all) were probably Peripatetic products. The *De Coloribus* has been ascribed to Theophrastus and to Strato. The *De Audibilibus* has also been attributed to Strato. The *De Plantis*, alone of these treatises, was possibly in its original form written by Aristotle, and the meagre references to botanical science in Aristotle's accredited works, which otherwise are so inclusive, lends some support to this view. The first three treatises in the present volume, and also the last, have been translated by Messrs. T. Loveday and E. S. Forster, of the University of Sheffield. The translations of the *De Plantis*, the *Mechanica*, and the *Ventorum Situs et Cognomina* are the work of Mr. Forster alone. The *De Plantis* is translated from a Latin text dating from the thirteenth century, the original Greek and the Arabic translation from which the Latin text had been rendered having been lost. It is noteworthy that the only existing Greek edition of the treatise is one which is three times removed from the original.

Excepting for the *De Plantis* the treatises contained in this volume are of relatively small scientific interest. The *De Coloribus* and *De Audibilibus* show little evidence of that extraordinary insight into natural phenomena which gained for Aristotle for many centuries

the foremost place among scientific authorities. The *Physiognomonica* is full of fantastic statements which have little or no basis in fact. The *Mechanica* belongs to a different category. It is a technical treatise on the principles of Mechanics, and deals with many practical applications. The *Ventorum Situs*, which is usually attributed to Theophrastus, is a very short work, describing the charts of the winds. The concluding treatise is philosophical in character, and deals with the views of Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias upon Being and Not-being.

Of all the works collected in this volume, to a man of science the *De Plantis* is the most interesting, if only for the remarkable anticipation of the results of later investigation into the phenomena of sex among plants. The author not only clearly recognised the separate existence of male and female elements in vegetable organisms, but also the essential similarity between the reproductive processes of plants and those occurring in animals. In the same chapter we read that 'plants are only created for the sake of animals, and animals are not created for the sake of plants.' This statement is noteworthy

because, taken in conjunction with its context, it seems to indicate something more than a dim perception of the fact that animals are dependent, either directly or ultimately, upon plants for their source of energy, whereas plants can obtain their necessary supply of energy without the help of animals. In a later part of the treatise the author describes the influence of the environment upon plants, and refers to the effects of cultivation on wild species. He states further that one kind of plant may, under certain conditions, change into another kind, and thus he appears vaguely to have foreshadowed the Lamarkian doctrine of specific mutability as a result of changes in the surroundings.

Whether or not the authorship of this treatise is that of Aristotle—and most authorities agree in attributing it to another hand—the work is truly a remarkable one and well worthy of study. The present translation is very readable, and together with those of the other treatises contained in this volume, constitutes a valuable addition to the series in which it appears.

F. H. A. MARSHALL.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

E. WALSER, *POGGIUS FLORENTINUS LEBEN UND WERKE*.

Poggius Florentinus Leben und Werke.
By E. Walser. Pp. 1-567. Leipzig:
Teubner, 1914.

It is somewhat singular that the correspondence of Poggio should never have been properly edited. An attempt was made in the last century by Tommaso Tonelli, who drew most of his material from a very important MS. in the Riccardiana Library at Florence. The first volume, which appeared in 1839, is a well-known work. The two other volumes, which were printed after his death, met with a singular fate. There is a copy in the National Library at Florence, somewhat soiled and defaced by various borrowers, and another passed into the possession of Dr. Wilmanns, the late librarian at Berlin. No other copies are known to exist, and it is supposed

that the impression must have been retired from circulation owing to some quarrel between Tonelli's family and the publishers. Dr. Wilmanns made preparations for a new and enlarged edition,¹ but found the task beyond his powers. Consequently, while the letters of several minor humanists have found capable editors, those of Poggio, the greatest Italian researcher, the prince of letter-writers in the fifteenth century, the Secretary of eight Popes, are still inaccessible except in a very imperfect form.

Dr. Walser of Zurich has set himself to repair this deficiency, and has issued this preliminary volume upon the life of Poggio, to be followed by a complete

¹ His results appear in *Central-Blatt f. Bibliothekswesen*, xxx. (1913), pp. 289-331, 443-463.

edition of the letters gathered together from all sources. It is impossible to praise too highly the industry which he has shewn. He has ransacked the records of Florence and Rome, making especial use of the information furnished by the registers of taxation, and his researches enable us to follow with great exactitude the fortunes of Poggio from the days when he came to Florence as a poor boy with five *soldi* in his pocket to his death at the age of 79, rich, full of honours, the ex-Chancellor of his adopted city.

Zielinski,¹ when discussing what he terms the 'ancient caricatures' of Cicero, remarks that 'legend travels with little luggage and loses something at each halting-place.' This saying is very true of Poggio, who has been chiefly known from caricatures. He became unpopular with both parties in the great religious struggles of the sixteenth century. His *Facetiae*, a collection of scandalous stories in which corrupt priests and monks play a leading part, were put on the Index by the Council of Trent, although they caused no offence in the days of Nicholas V. On the other hand, Protestant writers naturally took sides with his enemy Valla, the bold critic and free-thinker, from whom they themselves drew inspiration. The manifold activities of Poggio were forgotten, and he was remembered only as the discoverer of MSS. and the author of the *Facetiae*. His name became a synonym for the worship of antiquity, religious indifference and heathenism in general. He was confused with his own sons, also with later writers. In modern days silly fables have gathered round his name, such as the legend that he forged the Annals of Tacitus, a work which has come down to us from two MSS., one of which (Bks. xi.-xvi.) was known to Boccaccio before Poggio's birth, while the other (Bks. i.-vi.) was not brought to Italy until 50 years after his death.

It is impossible here to do more than indicate the manner in which Walser has treated Poggio's life and works. He devotes to the subject nineteen chapters. Some of these are historical, while others contain an appreciation of

various writings. The chief periods into which his life falls are those of his youth, his entry into the Curia in 1403 at the age of 23, his activities during the Council of Constance (1414-18), his residence for four years in England as a *protégé* of Cardinal Beaufort, his return to Rome in 1423 followed by 30 years' service in the Curia under Martin V., Eugenius IV., and Nicholas V. In 1453, at the age of 73, he returned to Florence as Chancellor, and held this post, as it seems with but indifferent success, until within a year of his death. His vitality was astonishing. When 56 he married a girl of 18, Vaggia, belonging to the noble family of the Buondelmonti; his last son was born when he was 70; when Chancellor of Florence he sometimes thought of returning to the Curia, and attached great value to the honorary post of Secretary under Calixtus III.; at a later date he made overtures to Venice, with the object of entering the service of the Republic. Shortly before his death he recovered the energy of youth, when the oft-repeated story of the complete Livy at Sorøe in Denmark was revived. He urges on Cardinal di Colonna the need of instant action. The treasure must be brought to Bruges; there he will arrange for its transport to Geneva and subsequent carriage to Italy. He says, 'this is not the time for sleep or slumber, but for rapid action. I would that I had wings so as to be with you.' His fierce temper was not calmed by age, as may be seen from his savage words on the death of Aurispa, his rival as a researcher.²

Walser is most impartial in his treatment of Poggio's character. He extenuates nothing and balances the evidence with the greatest care. There is, however, one charge brought against Poggio by Roman Catholic writers and notably by Pastor, that of unorthodoxy, which he shews to be wholly baseless. Walser says that Poggio's philosophical creed is entirely Christian. He only takes from antiquity what is consistent with a firm belief and a mediaeval orthodox conception of the world. This strong conviction of perfect orthodoxy and sincerely Christian atti-

¹ *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, ed. 2, p. 15.

¹ P. 544.

² P. 554.

tude is the reason why Poggio so calmly presents to Popes and Cardinals his writings in which peccant priests and monks are satirized so unmercifully. It never occurred to him for one moment that any one could see in them any pronounced hostility to the teaching of Christ or His servants.¹

It is to be noticed that one of the chief charges which Poggio brings against Valla was heresy.²

Poggio character was many-sided. His enthusiasm for research was derived from Niccolo Niccoli, his *dulcissimus Nicolaus* who called out all that was best in him. His political views resembled those which were subsequently set forth by Machiavelli.³ In his ferocity and coarseness he reminds us of Swift, whom also he resembled in an undercurrent of tenderness and in his fundamental piety. In his gift for self-revelation, in his cupidity, and in his behaviour towards Vaggia, he reminds us of that excellent public servant, Mr. Samuel Pepys.

Among the new letters published by Walser the gem is one written to Nicholas V. in 1454, when Poggio was suffering from gout.⁴ It is written in Poggio's most familiar style, and shows that to him the Pope still remained his old friend, the 'little bell-priest'⁵ of Florence, Tommaso Parentucelli. He tells a story of a priest at Terranuova who suffered so much from gout that he had to be carried to the altar and sat down while saying Mass. He continued, however, to drink his *Trebiano*, saying that the consequences were the same whether he drank deeply or practised abstinence.

Among the documents there are many of great interest, e.g. Poggio's matriculation as notary at Florence in 1402;⁶ his appointment as Rector of Drokenesford in the diocese of Winchester in 1423, although only in minor orders;⁷ a pass given to his mother Jacopa after a visit to Rome in 1426.⁸

On this occasion she travelled with much luggage:

Cum duobus saccis plenis filato et pannis laneis et lineis aliisque rebus et bonis instrumentis suis de summo deputatis necnon argenterii et aliquibus rebus commestibilibus.

Poggio's will¹ was made in October, 1443. A noticeable feature in this is the number of benefactions made to convents and churches and the provision of masses for the souls of the testator and his parents. Poggio was devoted to his young wife, then twenty-four years of age, but his provisions about her do not strike the reader as liberal. Not only are restrictions upon her re-marriage imposed, but her woollen and silk stuffs together with all his plate are to be sold in order to provide for his funeral expenses. Also, she is not to keep in the house any of her relations, except for a brief period of mourning: *quod si secus fecerit, sit cum ea maledictio Dei*. Vaggia was the second child in a family of thirteen, and pushed her brothers with great energy. Possibly Poggio wished to protect her from her family.

One document is of capital importance, viz., the inventory of Poggio's goods made after his death.² I gather from Walser's account that it has not been previously published. If so, it is a discovery of the first magnitude.

The most interesting entry in the catalogue, at any rate to the present reviewer, is:

73. Orationes tullii V antique in pergameno.

This is the only MS. which is termed *antiquus*. The number of speeches (five) suggests that it was the *vetus Cluniacensis* obtained by Poggio from Cluni in 1414. The contents of this were *pro Milone*, *pro Cluentio*, *pro Murena*, *pro Sex. Roscio*, *pro Caelio*.

This identification (made by Walser) seems certain. If so, this ancient MS., which was used by various scholars after its arrival in Italy, including Poggio himself in 1429, but afterwards disappeared, was in the possession of Poggio at the time of his death.

Walser suggests, with some reserve, that the other speeches discovered by Poggio, viz. *pro Caccina*, *de lege agraria*, in

¹ P. 309. Cf. p. 323.

² Pp. 274, 531.

³ P. 522.

⁴ Vespasiano, *Vite*, p. 42 (*uno prete da suonare campane*).

⁵ P. 327.

⁶ P. 333.

⁷ P. 337.

¹ Pp. 359-370.

² Pp. 417-427.

Pisonem, pro Roscio Comoedo, pro Rabirio perduellionis reo, pro Rabirio Postumo may have formed No. 18, which is described as *orationes Tullii*. Elsewhere¹ he establishes definitely the provenance of these speeches, apart from the *pro Caecina*, which was known to have come from Langres. Previously we had only the worthless statement of Vespasiano, the Florentine bookseller, that Poggio found some of them under a heap of rubbish. Walser shows from a minute written by Niccolo Niccoli for the instruction of researchers in German libraries² that Poggio found them in the smaller library belonging to Cologne Cathedral. He was not able to see the larger library about which, as Niccolo says, he heard marvellous stories, owing to the absence of the librarian. This library without doubt contained the MSS. given by Hildebald, minister of Charlemagne, many of which still remain in the present library. It was in Cologne that Nicholas of Cues shortly afterwards (in 1426) discovered a second copy of the speeches *de lege agraria* and in *Pisonem*, together with twelve new plays of Plautus and other treasures.³ It would appear probable that this discovery was made in the larger library.

The following entries are interesting, in view of recent controversies :

57. Servius in papirio. Sirius (*i.e.* Silius) ytalicus in papirio coopertum corio rubeo.

60. Astronomicon cum multis aliis in papirio coopertum corio albo.

Here the *Astronomicon* = Manilius. Since there is no mention in the catalogue of Sigiberti Chronicon, Asconius, Valerius Flaccus, and the *Silvae* of Statius, it seems a fair inference that these works, now found in the two Madrid MSS. M. 31, X. 81, were combined in No. 60. That they once formed one volume is shown by an index at the beginning of M. 31, viz.

¹ P. 58.

² P. 102. This document recently came to light. It is contained in a MS. containing philosophical works of Cicero described by De Marinis in *MSS. incunables et livres rares No. XII*. 1913 (Florence). The MS. was acquired by Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. Cf. *Woch. f. Kl. Philol.*, 1913, p. 701.

³ *Cl. R.* xx. (1906), p. 226.

Manilii Astronomicon, Statii Papinii Sylvae, Asconius Pedianus in Ciceronem, Valerii Flacci nonnulla.

Walser has no doubt that the *Chronicle* of Sigibert, which Poggio found in England, is in his handwriting.¹ The MS. of Silius Italicus, which is so often mentioned in connexion with the contents of the Madrid MSS. appears to have been bound up with Servius by Poggio. While speaking of these MSS., I may add that Walser regards the receipt given by Poggio to the monks of St. Gall for the MS. of Asconius as relating only to a temporary loan of the book which was subsequently returned.²

Poggio also had his autograph copy of Quintilian, No. 17 (*manu Poggi*). This must be the *originale Poggi*, now lost, referred to in the colophons found in *Vat. Urb.* 327, and *Ambros. B.* 153 sup. Other interesting entries are (27) Tacitus, (45) Propertius, (63) Lucretius, (65) Catullus.

Walser gives various specimens of Poggio's handwriting. His calligraphic script is to be found in *Laur.* 48. 22: *Philippics, in Catilinam*; *ibid.* 50. 31: *de Oratore, Paradoxa, Brutus, Orator*; *ibid.* 67. 15: *Eusebius de temporibus*. *Vat.* 3245: *de Legibus, Academica*: *Berol. Ham.* 166: *ad Atticum*. All of these are signed by him.³

The only MS. possessing his signature, which is written in a cursive hand, is the *Matritensis* x. 81. Walser also gives specimens of his cursive hand, both in Latin and in Italian, as found in ordinary documents.

Various fictitious names have been assigned to Poggio, generally those of his sons. Thus in the standard work of Voigt he is still called *Gianfrancesco*,⁴ while other writers speak of him as *Francesco*, a name due to confusion with

¹ P. 54. Cf. *Cl. R.* x. (1896), p. 302.

² *Cl. R.* xxvi. (1912), p. 263, xxvii. (1913), p. 38.

³ It is unfortunate that in Ehrle and Liebaert's *Specimina Codd. Latinorum*, a leaf from *Vat.* 3331 is given as an example of Poggio's hand. The date (1453) makes this impossible. Cf. *Cl. R.* xiii. (1899), p. 120. Walser doubts whether it or the companion MS. *Vat.* 3330 were even *libri Poggii* (p. 107).

⁴ *Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, i. p. 327 (ed. 3).

the later poet, Francesco Bracciolini. Walser shows decisively that there is no authority for these names.¹ He speaks of him as Poggio Bracciolini, and, in common with other modern writers, frequently terms him Bracciolini simply. The Bracciolini of Pistoia were a noble family, and Poggio used their arms when he entered the College of Priors in 1455.² A survey of the documents printed by Walser suggests that his connexion with the Bracciolini was an invention of his later years.

Poggio is an Italian form for Podius, the name of a saint, once Bishop of Florence. Poggio's father was named Guccio, and his grandfather Poggio. It may be noticed that one of Poggio's natural sons was named Guccio. Poggio's father was a poor apothecary³ living at Terranuova with property valued at 40 lire in the register of 1373. The district was a poor one, as is shown by the note of the official, *nulli sunt nobiles habitantes in dicto communi*. The description of the father is *Guccius Poggii*, and his son is called *Poggius Guccii*. In all the early documents Poggio is described as Ser Poggio di Guccio, Ser Poggio de Terranova, etc. In the tax return for 1412 we find Poggio di Ghuccio di Poggio.⁴ In the register of his marriage (1436) and still later in the deed, when he was appointed Chancellor of Florence, he is still *Poggius Guccii*,⁵ without any mention of the Bracciolini. The first document in which he claims connexion with this noble house in his will, made in 1443, when he was 63 years of age.⁶ From this time onwards the name Bracciolini appears not infrequently—e.g. in a deed executed in 1457 he is termed *D. Poggio ol. Guccii de Bracciolinis Florentia*.⁷ The reticence, however, of the Signoria, on the occasion of his appointment as Chancellor in 1453, is very significant. I cannot but

conclude that Poggio acquired noble ancestors late in life, possibly at the instigation of his aristocratic wife. I, therefore, suggest that scholars should cease to call him Bracciolini, at any rate without Poggio, and give him the name under which he gained his reputation.

There are very few points to which objection may be raised. On p. 27 the Berlin MS. of Cicero's letters to Atticus, written by Poggio in 1408, is said to be a copy taken from the MS. discovered by Capra. This cannot be so, since Capra's MS. contained Books I-VII. only.¹ It seems to have been a member of the Σ family, while the Berlin MS. belongs to the Δ group, and is connected with Med. 49. 18.²

On p. 56 the Madrid MS. of Manilius is called 'die Quelle aller Handschriften.' It is the parent of several fifteenth-century MSS., but there is a rival family represented by three MSS. of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which also have their descendants.³

On p. 105 there are two incorrect statements concerning the Cluni MS. of Cicero, viz. that the new speeches which it contained were the *pro Cluentio* and *pro Murena*, and that it was retained for many years by F. Barbaro. These are clearly due to accident, since on pp. 50, 58, the *pro Sex. Roscio* is coupled with the *pro Murena*, and it is rightly stated that the MS. lent to F. Barbaro contained Poggio's discoveries at Langres and Cologne. On p. 108 *Paedianus* is an incorrect spelling for *Pedianus*, as is shown by Silius Italicus, xii. 212.

In the account of Poggio's last phase (1458-9) no mention is made of Vaggia's death. It is only from the documents that we learn of her decease in February, 1458, *di infermita lunga*, and her burial in S. Croce. Her death must have been a great blow to her aged and ailing husband. It seems singular that nothing should be said in the text about this bereavement.

It will be gathered that Walser's

¹ P. 6.

² P. 1.

³ In the tax-collector's register for 1373, he is described as *spetiale* (p. 326). This is a new discovery. He was previously supposed to be a notary. Shortly afterwards Guccio became bankrupt and went to Arezzo, *colla donna e tre fanciulli* (p. 327).

⁴ P. 331.

⁵ Pp. 353, 382.

⁶ P. 360.

⁷ P. 407.

¹ *Cl. R.*, xxv. (1911), pp. 150-1.

² Sjögren, *Commentationes Tullianae*, pp. 25-36.

³ Garrod, *Manili Astronomicon*, Lib. ii., p. lv.

book is of primary importance for all students of the Italian Renaissance, and especially for those who are in-

terested in the transmission of Latin classical authors.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

THREE DIALOGUES OF SENECA.

L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum Libri X., XI., XII.—Three Dialogues of Seneca. Edited by J. D. DUFF, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. lx+312. University Press, Cambridge, 1915. 4s. net.

THESE so-called dialogues, or epistolary essays as they might be termed, well deserve the excellent commentary now provided for them. It is a little difficult to realise that the whole of the nineteenth century produced no commentary upon their matter, though much was done for their text. The three are *Ad Paulinum*, 'On the Shortness of Life'; *Ad Polybium*, condolences sent to one of Claudius' freedmen on his brother's death; and *Ad Helviam*, a consolation to Seneca's mother on his own exile. All three possess a good deal both of Senecan and of human interest. The *De Breuitate Vitae* in particular is full of good sense and good taste. Unreal it may appear to be in its stock praises of philosophy and rather ill-considered in its proposal to draw Paulinus away from useful public service in managing the corn-supply; but it is a much better performance than Seneca's artificial consolations, and it has the saving grace of smart satire upon many a mode of wasting time, among which the more meticulous inquiries of pedants are included. There is much to prompt the belief that the essays and letters of Seneca might profitably be granted more place in the curricula of our University colleges.

A very useful Introduction discusses the subjects of the three books, their dates, the persons to whom they are addressed, and the Seneca family, with several incidental questions bearing on their times. A brief account is given of the extant MSS. and the history of the text. Mr. Duff's arguments, in opposition to most scholars, that the Marcus of the *Ad Helviam* is not Seneca's son but his nephew, young Lucan, will be found difficult to refute. It is by far

the most natural sense in which to take Seneca's words.

To the revision of the Text—never an easy task in Seneca—Mr. Duff has devoted much care, though he complains of having been misled into unnecessary labour by the absence in the latest Teubner edition of a distinct reference to the 1886 edition of the eminent Danish authority Gertz or to his *Critica Studia*, in which unforgettable services were rendered by Madvig's pupil to the text of Seneca. The omission is the more remarkable in that the Teubner editor mentions other publications by Gertz, and in his Preface I observe he says, 'Gertzio uero quid debeam unaquaque pagina ostendit.' Mr. Duff's apparatus criticus does not claim to be exhaustive, but it is a handy one in which the services of scholars of the past like Lipsius and Gronovius are recognised alongside of recent textual criticism. A little of Bentley's 'gold dust,' to adapt his own phrase about Pearson's writings, has been found in his Elzevir of 1672 and sprinkled—what little there was—all too sparsely in the critical notes; and the editor has made contributions of his own which are the fruits of mature study and deliberate judgment.

Among these latter is his attractive suggestion of '*nobilis uero ad nostrum arbitrium nasci licet*' for *nobis*, *Ad Paulin.* 15, 3; and at 17, 6 the likely restoration of *ibat*, a more suitable tense than the *ibit* of the MSS., which was probably assimilated by a copyist to the tense of *reuocabitur* just preceding. In the same paragraph the editor reads '*Marium caliga dimisit, consulatus exercet*,' where his plural verb is no doubt historically exact, although the traditional singular *exercet* is quite good and clear rhetoric. In *Ad Polyb.*, 16, 3, the words *amisi sororem* form a reasonable insertion which the sense needs, and which must have fallen out before the following '*amisi Germanicum*.' On the other hand, in the next chapter,

17, 5, the acceptance of a foreign scholar's addition of *tondens* after the second *modo* seems to me more doubtful: there is a fair enough antithesis suggested in the reading of the MSS. 'modo barbam capillumque submittens, modo Italiae ac Siciliae oras errabundus permetiens,' i.e. 'now letting his beard grow (in token of mourning at home), now restlessly scouring the coasts of Italy and Sicily.' The reading adopted at *Ad Paulin.* 9, 1, 'potestne quicquam esse leuius hominum eorum iudicio qui prudentiam iactant,' embodies neat suggestions by Professor Housman for rectifying an unsatisfactory sentence of the MSS. 'potestne quicquam sensus hominum eorum dico qui prudentiam iactant.' A glance at Hermes' Teubner edition will prove how copiously amended the passage has been—and how unconvincingly until now.

In the Notes, Mr. Duff brings to bear on the elucidation of his author's meaning and form of expression an admirable acquaintance with Seneca's extant works, and with other writers of the Early Empire. Great care is taken to explain and illustrate Senecan usages; and beginners in Silver Latin will find themselves constantly instructed as to contrasts with Ciceronian Latinity. Personally, I feel that in some of these notes the word 'classical' gets too narrow a connotation: e.g. on p. 273 it is stated that '*quibus . . . fuit*, being a causal sentence, would be *quibus . . . fuerit* in classical Latin'; and on p. 278 for *ipsis* it is said 'classical usage requires *sibi*.' I should not assent to the implication that Seneca is a non-classical author, and cannot see why in such cases reference is not simply made to 'the Latin of the Ciceronian age,' if that is what is meant. Historical allusions are amply elucidated and the instances pointed out where lapse of memory or excess of rhetoric has betrayed Seneca into inaccuracy. There is also much valuable light thrown on Roman life and society.

In the comment, *Ad Paulin.* 1, 1, upon *publico*, meaning 'universal,' I am not sure that it is right to say that 'Ovid begins the use'; for does not Horace's '*publica cura*' applied to the

bewitching Barine (*Od.* II. viii. 8) mean that she was the 'universal distraction' of the youth of Rome? To the passages cited, *Ad Paulin.* 2, 1, in illustration of 'in superuacuis laboribus operosa sedulitas,' or the pursuits of the busy triflers, there ought certainly to be added the amusing satire contained in Phaedrus II. v., where, besides the explicit mention of this precious tribe ('ardalionum quaedam Romae natio'), it is described in terms familiar to readers of this treatise by Seneca as 'occupata in otio.' The *nobiles equi* of *Ad Paulin.* 18, 4, in the sense of 'thoroughbred horses,' and their *generosa pernicitas* mentioned just afterwards, might well have been paralleled by the use of the Greek γενναῖος in such passages as that in which Socrates compares himself ἵππῳ μεγάλῳ μὲν καὶ γενναίῳ, *Apol.* 30. And in *Ad Paulin.* 20, 2 *corona* in the sense of a 'ring of listeners' should have had the older illustration of Ovid *Métam.* xiii. 1 cited ('consedere duces et uulgi stante corona,' etc.), especially as the phrase actually quoted from Quintilian (XII. x. 74, 'uulgi corona') is, I fancy, an echo of Ovid. If such additions are occasionally desiderated, they are here recorded only with a keen appreciation which a distant clansman may be permitted to express for the wide range of Mr. Duff's own parallels and illustrations; but much often wants more!

I should like to comment on two points of subject-matter in the *Ad Polybium*. The first is at 16, 5, where Fortune is said to 'venture upon entry even into those homes the approach to which lies through temples' ('eas quoque domos ausa . . . intrare in quas per templa aditur'). The meaning is in the note declared to be uncertain, and two explanations are offered. But there can be little doubt that the second is the correct one: Seneca must have had in mind Caligula's impious use of the temple of Castor and Pollux as a kind of vestibule to his palace, and Seneca, it may be remembered, mentions or alludes to Caligula several times in the treatise quite near this passage (e.g. 13, 1; 13, 4; 17, 3-6). The other point is at 8, 3, where I cannot help thinking that most scholars make too

much of Seneca's remark that the composition of fables of Aesopic type was 'intemptatum Romanis ingeniis opus.' Usually this is supposed to imply either a blissful ignorance or a deliberate ignoring of Phaedrus. I agree with the editor in rejecting Teuffel's idea that Seneca had never heard of the publication of Phaedrus's fables, for this is unbelievable in a man of his literary tastes even in exile; but I do not think it necessary as an alternative to believe that he 'wilfully ignores Phaedrus in order to pay an undeserved compliment to Polybius' (Introd., p. xxiii.). Seneca, it should be observed, is writing to a freedman of Greek or at least non-Roman origin, and quite accurately remarks that fable-writing had not been attempted by *Roman* intellects. In my opinion he remembered quite distinctly that Phaedrus had composed and published fables within recent years, but in addressing one who was either a Greek

or an Oriental he also remembered that Phaedrus was a Greek by birth and with intentional accuracy used the words 'intemptatum *Romanis* ingeniis opus.' The phrase may be taken in a perfectly complimentary sense without implicating Seneca in a falsehood. 'Fables,' he means, 'are a sort of literary work which we Romans have not tried.'

The statement (Introd., p. xxxv.) that Pliny's *Natural History* was written 'forty years after the exile of Seneca' is made with less than the editor's usual exactitude; and in the Preface, p. iv, the reference to p. lvii should be altered to p. lix. But it is not often that either editor or proof-reader can be impugned in this careful piece of work.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

*Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

SHORT NOTICES

East Christian Paintings in the Freer Collection. By CHARLES R. MOREY. University of Michigan Series. Vol. XII.: Studies in East Christian and Roman Art. Part I. Macmillan Company.

THOSE who have seen the facsimiles of Mr. Freer's biblical MSS. will know that they are a discovery of the first importance. This book contains plates of the covers of the Washington MS., with portraits of the four evangelists; the description attached is a summary of that printed with the Facsimile of the MS., which Mr. Freer has presented to the world of scholars. They are two boards joined by a leather back, to which chains have been added at a later date. John is almost erased; Mark is an elderly man, with grey hair, partly bald, and a long beard; Matthew and Luke, men in the prime of life, with black hair and beards. Of these, Mark seems to be a distinct Coptic type, while the others resemble the types known in Byzantium. Mark, it will be

remembered, was Bishop of Alexandria. All these paintings are later than the MS., which is of the fourth century or earlier.

From another MS., a cursive, of an Evangelium, Mr. Freer possesses five parchment leaves; eight miniatures are here reproduced in colours. There are portraits of Mark and John, the Descent from the Cross, the Descent into Hell, the Doubting of Thomas, Christ and the Holy Women, Madonna and the Saints. Mark is seated at a lectern on which perches a bird, probably meant for a dove, holding an open book; in the portrait of John, the bird is replaced by a human half-figure, holding an open book. It seems more likely that these figures represent the inspiring spirit dictating the gospel, than that they are symbols of the evangelists as the editor thinks. The next two scenes are carefully criticised by the editor, who gives a tabular analysis of a large number of parallels for comparison, and several pictures in the text.

Doubting Thomas is a rare scene in

art, and the Holy Women almost equally so. These and the Madonna are much damaged, but the two Descents are well preserved, and St. John is gracefully drawn, but most of the figures are formal and crude. One of the pages of the MS. is also given. The remaining plates are taken from a MS. of the Climax, with a portrait of St. John Climacus and the scene of the ladder. All these are discussed archaeologically.

The reproductions are wonderfully good, and the texture of the vellum, with its folds and stains, is clearly seen; the book is most valuable for students of Christian art, and we feel that America is fortunate in possessing a citizen of such munificence as Mr. Freer.

W. H. D. R.

Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons. Von AXEL W. PERSSON. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1915.

THE author has submitted to a searching and systematic investigation the text of (a) the papyri, and (b) of the *testimonia* in ancient and, to some extent, in medieval writers. Anyone who has had to deal with the text of Xenophon on a large scale will have discovered for himself how necessary this work was, and can realise also how great the labour must have been. I wish, without reserve, to offer my sincere congratulations to Dr. Persson on the accomplishment of a heavy task, and, still more, on the importance of the results at which he has arrived.

These results affect principally the text of the *Anabasis* and the *Cyropaedia*. Briefly, Dr. Persson shows that in the *Anabasis* the recent editors—that is Gemoll and myself—have been misled by Hug's *Commentatio de Xenophontis Anab. Codice*, C, i.e. *Parisinus*, 1640. Hug traced this MS. to a Byzantine original written between 870 and 911 A.D. He placed C upon a pedestal, and Gemoll, in his first edition, actually took C to be the one and only MS. worthy of attention. Against this one-sided admiration of *Parisinus* 1640 I raised a first protest (*Praef. Anab.* iv.); and Gemoll rewrote his apparatus for

his second edition, having in his first ignored the *deteriores*. But now comes Dr. Persson with the disquieting suggestion that the Paris MS., lately so trusted, is probably a Byzantine critical edition, and that the true text is something much more like that of the so-called *deteriores* than we have supposed. It is clear that, before future progress can be made with the text of the *Anabasis*, *Vaticanus* 1335 and *Marcianus* 511 must be collated. And I am convinced by Dr. Persson's arguments that in my edition the reading relegated to the critical notes ought in many cases to change places with the text.

In the *Cyropaedia* I had already pointed out (*Praef.* p. vii) that there are three groups of MSS. These are now conveniently labelled *x*, *y*, *z*. For practical purposes *x* is *Parisinus* 1640, for the Eton MS., which belongs to the same group, is of little account.

y=*Bodleianus* (Canonicus 39) and *Erlangensis*, *z*=*Escorialensis* t. iii. 14, *Parisinus* 1635 and *Guelpherbytanus* 71, 19. Dr. Persson shows clearly that the readings of *y* are most widely represented in the papyri and the citations, and less widely those of *z*. Of *x* there is no trace; and therefore *x* may be confidently declared the result of a Byzantine recension.¹ I cannot understand why Dr. Persson, who is for the most part scrupulously fair in his criticisms, even when he is severely trouncing Gemoll or me, or both of us, states repeatedly that my text is based on *x*. The whole of my preface, in which he points out many errors of detail, is devoted to proving the antiquity of *y* and to depreciating *x*. 'Eorum quae CE habent singularia neminem fugit quam exilia fuerint et incerta superiori memoria iudicia.' I had no clear opinion, to be sure, of the relative importance of *y* and *z*: but I did feel clear that *x* is below them in importance for the text. I thought when I finally read my text that I had not given enough weight to *y*; and I am sure of it after reading Dr. Persson.

E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ In what the author says about *Vaticanus* 1335 at p. 8 he seems to have forgotten that before V, 5, 35 only I, 4, 15 *τὸτε θῆρα* to I, 6, 31 *δικαιοσύνην* is in the thirteenth-century hand.

Xenophontis qui inscribitur libellus 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία in usum scholarum Academicarum edidit E. KALINKA. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914, M. 1.

IN his 'Praefatio' of some twenty-five pages M. Kalinka gives a careful account of the authorities, MSS. and editions; and the Greek text, with critical footnotes, occupies another twenty-five pages. That the text has received a deal of attention from philologists of bygone years is sufficiently shown by the footnotes, which, roughly speaking, take up nearly as much room as the text on every page. In the printing of the text the editor is decidedly conservative, adhering as closely as possible to the tradition, even where it is pretty clearly in need of correction. Thus in I. 5 the clause <ῆ> δι' ἔνδειαν χρημάτων ἐνίοις τῶν ἀνθρώπων is evidently incomplete; in I. 14 the words ὅτι ἐκπλέοντες συκοφαντοῦσιν, ὡς δοκοῦσι κτλ. are open to grave suspicion, and 'EK' himself suggests in the footnote ὅτι οἱ πλέονες: again, in the same section, the words οἱ ἰσχυροί can hardly be right immediately after ἰσχύουσιν, and ἔχυροί is the editor's own suggestion. In these and many similar cases the editor contents himself for the most part with recording doubts and emendations in the notes, while retaining in the text the traditional version, with an occasional asterisk to denote corruption. This is undoubtedly the best, as well as safest, course in the case of a treatise like this, where the style is such that really certain corrections are not easy to find or to make. In II. 4 I venture a suggestion different from any of those recorded by M. Kalinka. The text runs—τοῖς ἀρχουσι τῆς θαλάττης οἶόν τ' ἐστὶ ποιεῖν, ἅπερ τοῖς τῆς γῆς ἐνίοτε, τέμνειν τὴν γῆν τῶν κρειττόνων: and it seems clear that the relative clause ought to be negative rather than positive in sense. Instead of inserting an

οὐ with Sauppe and others, we might insert ἄπορα after ἅπερ. Again in II. 17 perhaps the original ran something like this—ἦν δὲ μὴ ἐμμένωσι ταῖς συνθήκαις, ἣ <εἴση> ὑφ' ὅτου ἀδικεῖ ἡ κοινὸν ἀπάντων τῶν ὀλίγων οὐ συνέθεντο. In conclusion, if only for its full and carefully wrought apparatus, this Teubner text is well worth acquisition by students of Xenophon and pseudo-Xenophons; while the observations of 'Xenophon' on 'thalattocracy' are of specially vivid interest for readers of to-day.

R. G. B.

Pōns Tīrōnum quem fecerunt R. B. APPLETON et W. H. S. JONES. Pp. 108. Londinii: apud aedes G. Bell et filiorum, 1914. Price 1s.

A FOURTH term book intended to familiarise the pupil with the simpler constructions of Latin syntax and thus form a bridge to the authors' *Puer Rōmānus*, a second year course in which more difficult sentence constructions are fully introduced. The subject-matter consists of 31 pages of narrative and descriptive prose put into the lips of a Roman boy with a view to giving some idea of Roman life, and is interspersed with illustrations, *domus, balneum, miles, convivae cenant, lectica, raeda, arator agrum arat, ludus litterārius*, etc. Thirty pages of exercises follow, some designed to help the pupil to assimilate the subject-matter, others to give practice in the constructions on which each section of the narrative is based. Reproductive and grammatical exercises, whether for classwork or homework, if they are to be of value, should be proportioned in difficulty to each stage of the text and should demand a real effort from the pupil. It must be noted with regret that in both these respects these exercises fail; they are far too easy.

F. M. P.

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE have received several numbers of *Iris*, the news-sheet of the Classical Association in Victoria, published monthly. It is now in its second year; and we are glad to see that there are meetings held

about every fortnight, with lectures or discussions. One of the sheets contains a translation of Horace iii. 9, 'into the American language.' We prefer Latin though it is said to be dead.

OBITUARY

ARTHUR FRANCIS LEACH.

THE death of Arthur Francis Leach is a great loss to the history of education in England. A Wykehamist and a Fellow of All Souls, he became an assistant Charity Commissioner in 1884. His work in connexion with endowed schools opened to him a field of inquiry which was largely unoccupied. His first publication dealt with English schools at the Reformation. His his-

tories of Winchester College and Warwick School are standard works, and his part in the Victoria County Histories corrected many current errors. Distrusting rash generalisations, he nevertheless established many general points, such, for instance, as the true meaning of a free school. He was by nature combative, but never to the point of obstinacy. His latest work, left unfinished at his death, is to be completed by another hand.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—An unintentional omission in my all too short review of Conway and Walters' *Liby I.-V.*, in the November issue, has been brought to my notice. I wish now to mention that a very large proportion of the work of colla-

tion for this volume was performed by the joint editor of the edition, Professor C. F. Walters, and that in the fixing of the text he was consulted throughout.—Yours faithfully,

A. SOUTER.

*The University, Aberdeen.
November 27, 1915.*

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

*** Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Botsford (G. W.) *A Syllabus of Roman History.* 7½" × 5". Pp. x + 72. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1915. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Vol. II. Documents of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Edited by J. de M. Johnson, Victor Martin, and A. S. Hunt. 12½" × 10". Pp. xx + 487, with 23 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 21s. net.

Iphigenia in Aulis (Choruses in). Translated by H. D. The Poets' Translation Series, No. 3. 6½" × 5". Pp. 20. London: *The Egoist*, 1915. 6d. net.

Lindsay (W. M.) *Notae Latinae.* An Account of Abbreviations in Latin MSS. of the early miniscule period (c. 700-850). 9" × 5½". Pp. xxiv + 500. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 21s. net.

Meillet (A.) *Introduction à l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes* (4^{me} édition). 9" × 5¾". Pp. xxvi + 502. Paris: Hachette et Cie., 1915. Fr. 10.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri (Part XI.). Edited, with Translations and Notes, by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. With seven collotype plates, 10¼" × 7½". Pp. xii + 278. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1915. Paper boards, 25s.

Ridgeway (W.) *The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of non-European Races*, in special reference to the Greek Tragedy. 10" × 6½". Pp. xiv + 448. Cambridge: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 15s. net.

Sumerian Tablets from Umma in the John Rylands Library, Manchester. Edited by C. L. Badale. 12½" × 10". Pp. xxiv + 16, with 10 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1915. Paper boards, 5s. net.

Theologisch Tijdschrift (1915). Aflevering VI. By B. D. Eerdmans. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh.

Thompson (J. A. K.) *The Greek Tradition.* Essays in the Reconstruction of Ancient Thought. With a Preface by Professor Gilbert Murray. 8" × 5½". Pp. xii + 248. London: Allen and Unwin, 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.

ERRATA.

P. 166, l. 22, *for* 'inexcusable' *read* 'excusable.'

P. 168, l. 27, *for* 'compounds' *read* 'components.'

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

A.

'ablative of time within which,' 121
 Achaean migration, route of the, 74
 active construction kept with passive verbs, 140
 Adam's (Mrs.) *Apology of Socrates*, noticed, 241
 adjective or participle ending in *-tus*, the, 200b
 Aeneadae, the, as Poseidon-worshippers, 72a
 Aeneas befriended by water-deities, 72 f.
 Aeneas' visit to Africa invented by Virgil, 121
 Aeschylus, influence of, on Sophocles, 8 ff.
 Aeschylus, *Persae*, notes on, 33 ff.
 See also p. 95
 Agar (T. L.), *δρσα* in Hesiod, 193 ff.
 Alcuin, 187b
 Allbutt (Sir Clifford), notice of Wagner's *Galenī qui fertur libellus EI ZION TO KATA PΑΣ-TPOΣ*, 115 f.
 Allen (S.), on Isidore VIII. xi. (§ 83), 220b
 Allen's *Selected Letters of Pliny*, noticed, 242a
 Andes (Vicus Andicus), 109b
 Antigone, the, and the *Prometheus Vincit*, 8 ff.
 Appleton (R. B.), notice of Bezard's *Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils*, 25 ff.
 notice of Murray's *Euripides and his Age*, 61 f.
 Appleton and Jones' *Pons Tiromum*, noticed, 255b
 archaic Thessalian epigram, an, 196 f.
 Aristophanes, *Aves* (488-498), 111
 Aristotle, *De Mundo* (399a, 7), 111
 Asmus, *Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos*, noticed, 31
 aspiration in Roman pronunciation due to Etruscan influence, 138
 to Venetic influence, 199
 Asteropaios, 73b
 ἀσπίς Σελπιος in Eur. *I.A.* (7-8), 47 f.
 Athenaens' text of Aristophanes, 213b, f.
 Athenians, collective wealth of the, 7b
 Augustus as Iuppiter, 46 f.
 Aurich's *Hagios Nikolaos, der Heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche*, noticed, 157
 Autolykos, derivation of the name, 20
 average price of a slave at Athens, 7a
 Axios, the river, 73b f.

B.

B., notice of Foucart's *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, 89
 Babylon, Herodotus' description of, 169
 difference between his dimensions and those shown by existing remains, how explained, 170

Bailey's *Some Greek and Roman Ideas of a Future Life*, noticed, 125 f.
 Bell (A. J.), Horace and the Scholia, 199 ff.
 note on Catullus (84), 137 ff.
 Bennett's *Syntax of Early Latin*, noticed, 119 ff.
 Besnier's *Lexique de Géographie ancienne*, noticed, 93
 Bethe's *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, noticed, 181 ff.
 Bezard's *Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils*, noticed, 25 ff.
 Books Received, 32, 64, 96, 128, 160, 192, 224, 256
 Botting (C. G.), obituary notice of R. C. Seaton, 62
 Braunscholtz (G. E. K.), the nationality of Virgil, 104 ff.
 notice of Petersen's *The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ισκο- -ισκη-*, 23 f.
 notice of Sturtevant's *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation*, 24 f.
 Bryant's *Short History of Rome for Schools*, noticed, 90
 Bryant and Lake's *Elementary Latin Grammar* noticed, 30
 Burnet's *Greek Philosophy*, noticed, 141 ff.
 Burrage's *Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity*, noticed, 118 f.
 Bury (R. G.), notes on some passages in Plato's *Laws*, 170 f.
 notice of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia, Ethica Eudemia, de Virtutibus et Vitiis*, 156 f.
 notice of Asmus, *Des Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos*, 31
 notice of Kalinka's *Xenophontis qui inscribitur libellas 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, 255
 notice of Norvin's *Olympicdori Philosophi in Platonis Phaedonem Commentarium* and Wilke's *Philodemi de Ira liber*, 156
 notice of the *Oxford Aristotle: de Mundo, de Spiritu*, 244 f.
 Pindar, *Pyth.* II. (90 sqq.), 77
 Bury's *History of Greece* (new edition), noticed, 220b, f.
 Byrde's *Heracles*, noticed, 240a

C.

C. (R. T.), notes on Vespa, 48 f.
 'Caecias' or 'Circias,' 244b
 Caesar's criticism of Terence, 172a
 caesura after 'fourth trochee,' 165 f.
 Campbell's *Liuy*, Bk. XXVII., noticed, 240
 'caprification,' 36

- Carthage, naval supremacy of, 86b
 population of, 86a
 Catullus (LXXXIV.), note on, 137 ff., 198 ff.
 Charlemagne, Einhard's life of, 186 ff.
 Cheesman (Leonard), obituary notice of, 222 f.
 Cheesman's *Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, noticed, 218 f.
 Cicero, *ad Atticum* (XIII. 37, 2), 79
Clark (Albert C.), notice of Sihler's *Cicero of Arpinum*, 124 f.
 notice of Walser's *Poggius Florentinus Leben und Werke*, 246 ff.
 Clark's (Albert C.), *Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, noticed, 49 ff.
 Clark's (E. C.), *History of Roman Private Law*, Part II.: *Jurisprudence*, noticed, 92 f.
Clarke (W. K. Lowther), notice of Burrage's *Nazareth and the Beginnings of Christianity*, 118 f.
 notice of three Chicago monographs, 54 ff.
 Clenard as an educational pioneer, 65 ff, 97 ff., 129 ff.
 codices Vossiani, some, and the *Metamorphosis* of Ovid, 174 ff.
 Conway and Walters' *Livy* (Bks. i.-v.), noticed, 217 f.
 Cook's *Zeus: a study in ancient religion*, noticed, 80 ff.
 Corbie Scriptorium, types of minuscule used in the, 222b
 Corona, proper name, 197b
Correspondence, 32, 127, 192, 223, 256
 cranes as table birds, 148b
Crook (Robert F.), note on the meaning of *exilis* via (*Tristia* I. ii. 86), 78 f.

D.

- Dalton's *Letters of Sidonius*, noticed, 154 ff.
 Dardanians and Paonians, 72 ff.
Davies (G. A.), Plato, *Phaedo* (62A), 69 f.
 Demosthenes, character of, 206
 περί τῶν Συμμοριῶν, 5 ff.
 dialect scenes in Aristophanes, 214
 Dieterich's *Nekuia* (2nd ed.), noticed, 190b, f.
 Diocles, the informer, 111b
 Dionysus as Zeus re-born, 80b
 dithyramb, original theme of the, 84b, f.
 Dobson's *de Spiritu* of 'Aristotle,' noticed, 245
Duff (J. Wight), notice of Duff's *Three Dialogues of Seneca*, 251 ff.
 notice of Hense's *L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium Epistularum Moralium quae supersunt*, 150 ff.
 Duff's *Three Dialogues of Seneca*, noticed, 251 ff.

E.

- Edwards' *Odyssey* VI. and VII. noticed, 241b
 Eitrem's *Opferitus und Veropfer der Griechen und Römer*, noticed, 214 ff.
 Elliott's *Acharnians of Aristophanes*, noticed, 212 ff.
 emendations in Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 213
 English pronunciation of Latin, 211b, f.
 ἑπταλ of Attica, value of, 7a
 Erasmus at Louvain, 65 ff.
 Etruscans, original home of the, 31a
 Euripides, *Hercules Furens* (773-780), 68 f.
exilis via (*Tristia* I. ii. 86), note on the meaning of, 78 f.

F.

- Fairbank's *Athenian White Lekythoi*, noticed, 145 f.
famulus, familia, on the derivation of, 204
 Ferguson's *Legal Terms common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament*, noticed, 93
 final s, decay of, 198b
 Firmicus, a new edition of, 27 f.
 Fleschenberg's *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes in der Altertum*, 126
Foat (F. W. G.), note on Varro *L. L.* (§ 173 Müll.), 79
 Fogerty's *Sophocles' Electra*, noticed, 191 f.
 Forster's *de Mundo* of 'Aristotle,' noticed, 244
Fotheringham (J. K.), the probable error of a water-clock, 236 ff.
 Foucart's *Les Mystères d'Eleusis*, noticed, 89
 fourth foot of the Homeric hexameter, the, 165 ff.
 See p. 48
Fowler (W. Warde), an attack on the Hellespont in 84 B.C., 136 f.
 note on Ovid, *Tristia* III. 6 (8), 46 f.
 'futures of probability,' 203
 Fyfe's *Tacitus: the Histories*, noticed, 149 f.

G.

- G.**, notice of *School Atlas of Ancient History*, 126
G. (A.), notice of Aurich's *Hagios Nikolaos*, 157
 Galen, embryology of, 116b
Gardner (Alice), notice of Wright's *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, 143 ff.
Gardner (P.), notice of Fairbanks' *Athenian White Lekythoi* and Riezler's *Weissgrundige Attische Lekythen*, 145 f.
Garrod (H. W.), a new edition of Firmicus, 27 f.
 notice of Postgate's *Tibulli Carmina and Selections from Tibullus*, 158
 notice of Schanz's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, 91 f.
 Garrod and Mowat's *Einhard's Life of Charlemagne*, noticed, 186 ff.
Gaselee (S.), Greek Elegiacs, 48
 notice of Fleschenberg's *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum*, 126
 notice of Heseltine's *Petronius*; Rouse's *Seneca, Apocolocyntosis*, 91
Godley (A. D.), notice of Ramsay's *The Histories of Tacitus* and Fyfe's *Tacitus: the Histories*, 149 f.
Gow (A. S. F.), notice of Elliott's *Acharnians of Aristophanes*, 212 ff.
Gow (J.), Horatiana, 75 ff.
 grammar schools, English, 210 f.
Granger (Frank), the influence of the interjection on the development of the sentence, 12 ff.
 notice of Bailey's *Some Greek and Roman Ideas of a Future Life*, 125 f.
 notice of Leach's *Schools of Mediaeval England*, 210 ff.
 Greek Drama, origins of, 84 f.
 diminutive suffix -ισκο- -ισκη-, 23
 elegiacs, 48
 epigraphy, 87 ff.
 music, word accent in, 195 f.
 numeral signs, 88b
 orators, 100 ff.
Green (A. J. B.), notice of Besnier's *Lexique de Géographie ancienne*, 93
 Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* X., noticed, 50 f.

H.

- H. (A. S.)**, notice of *Papyri Iandanae*, 29 f.
Haines (C. R.), note on the parallelism between the *Prometheus Vinculus* of Aeschylus and the *Antigone* of Sophocles, 8 ff.
Hall's Ancient History of the Near East from the Earliest times to the battle of Salamis, noticed, 116 ff.
Harcum's Roman Cooks, noticed, 90
Harmon's Lucian, noticed, 29
Harrison (E.), Catullus (LXXXIV.), 198 f.
Harry (J. E.), ἀσκήρ Σελπιος in Eur. *I.A.* (7-8), 47 f.
 Sophocles, *Trachin.* (331), 112
Haverfield (F.), Herodotus and Babylon, 169 ff., 239
 notice of Cheesman's *Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, 218 f.
 obituary notice of G. L. Cheesman, 222 f.
Havet's Notes critiques sur le texte de Festus, noticed, 188 f.
Heisenberg's Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt, noticed, 31
Hellespont, an attack on the, in 84 B.C., 136
Hense's L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium Epistularum Moralium quae supersunt, noticed, 150 ff.
Heracles as intercessor, 10b
Herbig's Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen, noticed, 30 f.
 hereditary membership of Greek guild, 2a
Hermocope, the, alluded to in the *Birds* of Aristophanes, 111b
Herodotus and Babylon, 169 f., 239
 See also p. 223b, f.
 development of his work, 208
 his Lydian history, 209a
 priority of Bks. VII.-IX., 209b, f.
Heseltine's Petronius, noticed, 91
Homeric hexameter, the fourth foot of the, 165 ff.
 Hymns, some emendations of the, 161 ff.
Horace, Epistles II. i. (113-117), 19
Horace and the Scholia, 199 ff.
Horatiana, 75 ff.
Hort (Arthur F.), three emendations in Theophrastus, *Historia Plantarum*, 35 ff.
Housman (A. E.), *mergere* and Priap., 65, 173 f.

I.

- Ihm's Palaeographica Latina**, noticed, 157b, f.
Iliad, Bethe on the date and authorship of the, 181 ff.
 Imperial titles, inscriptions dated by, 4b
 inscriptions from Asia Minor, notes on some, 1 ff.
 interjection, influence of the, on the development of the sentence, 12 ff.
Isidore VIII. xi. (§ 83), 139b, f., 220b

J.

- Jacoby's Herodotos** (Pauly-Wissowa), noticed, 207 ff.
Jahn's Aeneid (I.-VI.), noticed, 185
James' Walter Map, De Nugis Curialium, noticed, 121 ff.
Jones' Intermediate Oral Latin Reader, noticed, 242b
Juan Luis Vives, 65 ff.

K.

- Kalinka's Xenophontis qui inscribitur libellus 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία**, noticed, 255
kantharoi, Boeotian, 114a
Keene (C. H.), obituary notice of, 94
 Keltic names in the family of Vergil, 104 ff.
Knox (A. D.), on a fragment of Comedy, 134 ff.
 'Kosenamen,' 20b, 24
Kroll's M. T. Ciceronis Orator, noticed, 185 f.
Kühner's Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache (2nd ed.), noticed, 119 ff.

L.

- Labyrinth of Minos**, the, 83b
Lamb's Clio Enthroned, noticed, 178 ff.
Landor on a verse of Julius Caesar, quoted, 172a
Larfeld's Griechische Epigraphik, noticed, 87 f.
 Latin, English mispronunciation of, 211b, f.
Leach's Schools of Mediaeval England, noticed, 210 ff.
Lenaeon drama, the, 84 f.
Libanius, religion of, 22 f.
Liebaert (Paul), obituary notice of, 222
Lindsay (W. M.), notice of Herbig's *Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen*, 30 f.
 notice of Sabinus' edition of Persius, 112
 notice of Skutsch's *Opuscula*, 90
 obituary notice of Abbé Liebaert, 222
Livy, I. 34 (1), 239b
Lorimer (W. L.), note on Aristophanes, *Aves* (488-498), 111
 Aristotle, *De Mundo* (399a, 7), *ib.*
Louvain University, work of Erasmus and his associates at, 65 ff.
Luscius Lanuvinus, Terence's criticism of, 172 f.
Lydian history in Herodotus, 209
Lykaon, 73b

M.

- M. (E. H.)**, notice of Ihm's *Palaeographica Latina*, 157b, f.
M. (L. E.), notice of Bryant's *Short History of Rome for Schools*, 90
Mackail (J. W.), the construction of the *Aeneid*, 225 ff.
Macurdy (Grace Harriet), the water-gods and Aeneas in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Books of the *Iliad*, 70 ff.
Madeley's Noctes Latinae, noticed, 242b
Magia (Virgil's mother), probably a Keltic name, 107 f.
Magnus, P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon, Libri XV., noticed, 56 ff.
Mantineia, Odysseus and Penelope connected with, 38 f.
MSS.:—
 of Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 212
 Firmicus, 27b
 Livy, 217b, f.
 N. T., 49 ff.
 Ovid, 56 ff., 174 ff.
 Persius, 112 f.
 Seneca, 150b, f.
Map, De Nugis Curialium, noticed, 121 ff.
Marchant (E. C.), notice of Persson's *Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons*, 254
 notice of Boyd's *Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil*, 148 f.

- Marshall (F. H. A.)**, notice of the *Oxford Aristotote*, 244 ff.
Maro, an Etruscan name, 107
Masinissa, 87
McIntosh, *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis*, noticed, 55b
Meltzer's *Geschichte der Karthager*, noticed, 85 ff.
Meusel's *C. Julii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Gallico*, noticed, 146 f.
Misson's *Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios*, noticed, 22 f.
Morey's *East Christian Paintings in the Freer Collection*, noticed, 253 f.
Moulton (James Hope), notice of Clark's *Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, 49 ff.
 notice of Ferguson's *Legal Terms common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament*, 93
 obituary notice of Professor Albert Thumb, 221 f.
Müller's *Ästhetischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien des Sophokles*, noticed, 243 f.
Murray's *Alcestis of Euripides*, noticed, 216 f.
Murray's *Euripides and his Age*, noticed, 61 f.
Murray's *Hamlet and Orestes, a study in traditional types*, noticed, 190
Myres (John L.), notice of Ure's *Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona in Boeotia*, 113 ff.

N.

- nationality of Virgil, the, 104 ff.
 Nazarenes and Nazoraeans, 118 f.
 Nikolaos, the Greek saint, 157b
Novin's *Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Phaedonem Commentaria*, noticed, 156
Notes, 18 ff., 47 ff., 77 ff., 111 ff., 139 ff., 170 ff., 203 ff., 239 ff.
Notes and News, 63, 159 f., 259
 noun and epithet, positions of, in pentameter, 45 f.

O.

- Obituaries**, 62, 94, 221 ff., 256
Odysseus, Boeotian origin of, 20
 derivation of the name, 20b
Odyssey, 'traditional book' theory of the, 20
Old Latin Bible, the, 55b
 orators, notes on Greek, 100 ff.
Original Contributions, 1 ff., 33 ff., 65 ff., 97 ff., 129 ff., 161 ff., 193 ff., 225 ff.
 ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, note on the phrase, 111
 ὄσσα in Hesiod, 193 ff.
Ovid, the *Metamorphosis* of, and some codices Vossiani, 174 ff.
Tristia III. 6 (8), 46 f.
Owen (A. S.), notice of Miss Fogerty's *Sophocles' Electra*, 191 f.
 notice of Harmon's *Lucian*, 29
 notice of Müller's *Ästhetischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien des Sophokles*, 243 f.
 notice of Pennell's *Pictures in the Land of Temples*, 58b, f.
 notice of Way's *Sophocles in English Verse*; Part IV., 28 f.
Owen (S. G.), notice of Showerman's *Ovid, Heroides and Amores*, 184 f.
Oxford Aristotote, notices of the, 245 ff.

P.

- P. (F. M.)**, notice of Appleton and Jones' *Pons Tironum*, 255b
P. (M.), notice of Heisenberg's *Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt*, 31

- P. (M.)**, notice of Murray's *Alcestis of Euripides*, 216 f.
 notice of Murray's *Hamlet and Orestes*, 190
Pais' Studi Storici per l'Antichità Classica, Vol. VI., noticed, 126b, f.
Pan as son of Penelope, 39 f.
Pantin (W. E. P.), notice of Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* and Bennett's *Syntax of Early Latin*, 119 ff.
 notice of Meusel's *C. Julii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Gallico*, 146 ff.
 notice of new volumes in Weidmann's series, 185 f.
 notice of two elementary Latin grammars, 30
Papyri Iandanae, noticed, 29 f.
 parallelism between the *Prometheus Vinculus* of Aeschylus and the *Antigone* of Sophocles, note on the, 10 ff.
 participle, uses of the, in the Apostolic Fathers, 55a
Pearson (A. C.), notice of Burnet's *Greek Philology*, 141 ff.
Penelope, derivation of the name, 39
 the 'waterfowl goddess,' 37 ff.
Pennell's *Pictures in the Land of Temples*, noticed, 158b, f.
Persson's *Zur Textgeschichte Xenophons*, noticed, 254
Peskett's *De Bello Civili*, Bk. II., noticed, 241b, f.
Petersen's *The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ισκος*, noticed, 23 f.
 Philhellenism, 31b
Phillimore (J. S.), in *Propertium retractationes selectae*, 40 ff.
Continued from Vol. XXVIII., Nos. 1 and 3.
 note on Horace, *Ep.* II. i. (113-117), 19
 note on Terence, *Eunuchus* (835-839), 18
 notice of Havet's *Notes critiques sur le texte de Festus*, 188 f.
Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.), notice of Cook's *Zeus: a study in ancient religion*, 80 ff.
Pickard-Cambridge's *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*, noticed, 204 ff.
Pindar, *Pyth.* II. (90 sqq.), 77, 230 ff.
Plato's *Laws*, notes on some passages in, 170 f.
Phaedo (62A), 69 f.
Republic IV. (442A), 78; VII. (514B), 77
Plutarchi Moralia (continued from Vol. XXVII., p. 262), 233 ff.
See also p. 95b
 pneuma, the doctrine of the, 115
Pohlenz's *Aus Platos Werdezeit*, noticed, 219 f.
 pomegranate, flower of the, 35 f.
 population of Athens in the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, 6b
Postgate's *Tibulli Carmina and Selections from Tibullus*, noticed, 158
Previté Orton (C. W.), notice of Garrod and Mowat's *Einhard's Life of Charlemagne*, 186 ff.
Prometheus Vinculus, the, and the *Antigone*, 8 ff.
 proper names mistaken for participles or nouns in inscriptions, 3b, f.
Propertium, *retractationes selectae* in, 40 ff.
Continued from Vol. XXVIII., Nos. 1 and 3.
Purser (L. C.), notes on Cicero *ad Atticum* (XIII. 37, 2), 79
 obituary notice of C. H. Keene, 94

Q.

- queen-bee, the, regarded as male by the ancients, 149b

R.

- Rabirius Postumus, 127
Rackham (H.), note on Plato, *Republic* VII. (514^B), 77
 Ramsay's *The Histories of Tacitus*, noticed, 149 f.
Reid (J. S. B.), notice of Clark's *History of Roman Private Law*, 92 f.
Reviews, 20 ff., 49 ff., 80 ff., 113 ff., 141 ff., 178 ff., 204 ff., 240 ff.
Richards (H.), notes on Greek orators, 100 ff.
 Plutarchi *Moralia*, 233 ff.
 Continued from Vol. XXVIII., p. 262
 Varia, 10 ff.
 Riezler's *Weissgründige Attische Lekythen*, noticed, 145 f.
Rischbieth (O. H. T.), notice of Pickard-Cambridge's *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom*, 204 ff.
 Robison's *Syntax of the participle in the Apostolic Fathers*, noticed, 55
Roche (A. E.), Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* (l. 1219), 203 f.
Rose (H. J.), on the text of Plato, *Republic* IV. (442A), 78
Rouse (W. H. D.), the active construction kept with passive verbs, 140
 notice of Hall's *Ancient History of the Near East*, 116 ff.
 notice of Morey's *East Christian Paintings in the Freer Collection*, 253 f.
 notice of Schoff's *Parthian Stations*, 126
 Royd's *The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil*, noticed, 148 f.
 Ryle's (Miss) *Olim*, noticed, 242b, f.

S.

- Σ, notice of new edition of Bury's *Greece*, 220b, f.
 notice of *A Selection of Latin Verse*, 28
 notice of some school editions, 240 ff.
S., notice of Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* X., 60 f.
 Sabinus' edition of Persius, 112
 sacrifice, Greek and Roman, 214 ff.
Sandys (Sir J. E.), cases of confusion between οὐδέ τι and οὐδ' ἐτι, 139
 a correction of Isidore (VIII. xi. 83), *ib.*
 Schanz's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, noticed, 91 f.
 Schoff's *Parthian Stations*, by Isidore of Charoux, noticed, 126
School Atlas of Ancient History, noticed, 126
 Seaton, (R. C.), obituary notice of, 62
Shackle (R. J.), some emendations of the Homeric Hymns, 161 ff.
 note on Theocritus *Idyll*, XV. (112), 18
Sheppard (J. T.), notes on Aeschylus, *Persae*, 33 ff.
 notice of Eitrem's *Opferritus und Veropfer der Griechen und Römer*, 214 ff.
 note on Euripides, *Hercules Furens* (773-780), 68 f.
 notice of Lamb's *Clio Enthroned*, 178 f.
 note on Pindar, *Pyth.* II. (90 sqq.), 230 ff.
Shewan (A.), notice of Bethe's *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, 181 ff.
 notice of Thomson's *Studies in the Odyssey*, 20 ff.
 the Waterfowl Goddess Penelope and her son Pan, 37 ff.
 ships, number of Greek, and of Athenian, at battle of Salamis, 8

- Short Notices**, 28 ff., 60 ff., 89 ff., 125 ff., 156 ff., 190 ff., 218 ff., 253 ff.
 Showerman's *Ovid, Heroides and Amores*, noticed, 184 ff.
 Sihler's *Cicero of Arpinum*, noticed, 124 f.
 Silo, the name, 109a
Slater (D. A.), some codices Vossiani and the *Metamorphosis* of Ovid, 174 ff.
 notices of Magnus, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV.*, 56 ff.
 slavery limited to a term of years, 172a
 slaves, number and average value of, at Athens, 354 B.C., 6b, f.
 Sloman's *Elementary Latin Grammar*, noticed, 30
 Smith's *Thucydides*, Bk. VI., noticed, 240b, f.
 Socrates, the 'Platonic,' a true portrait, 141b f.
 head of a Pythagorean society, whence he inherited the theory of Ideas, *ib.*
 Solomon's *Aristotle, Ethica Eudemia, De Virtutibus et Vitiis*, noticed, 156 f.
 Sophocles, how far indebted to Aeschylus, 8 ff.
 Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* (l. 1219), 203 f.
 Trachiniae (331), 112
Souter (A.), notice of Conway and Walters' *Livy* (Bks. i.-v.), 217 f.
 See p. 256.
 notice of Dalton's *Letters of Sidonius*, 154 ff.
 σάθον, Pindar's metaphor of the, 77, 230 ff.
 Stark's *Christology in the Apostolic Fathers*, noticed, 54 f.
 Sternkopf's *Cicero's Reden: Phil. III.-VI., VII.-X.*, noticed, 186
 Stock's *Aristotle, Magna Moralia*, noticed, 156
 Sturtevant's *Studies of Greek Noun-Formation: Labial Terminations III. and IV.*, noticed, 24 f.
Stuart-Jones (H.), notice of Pais' *Studi Storici per l'Antichità Classica*, 126 f.
 Sudhaus (S.), obituary notice of, 94b, f.
 Symmory system, Demosthenes' proposed reform of the, 5

T.

- Tatham (M. T.)**, *Livy* I. 34 (1), 239b
 Terence, *Eunuchus* (835-839), 18
 Terentiana, 172 f.
 Theocritus, *Id.* XV. (112), 18
 Theophrastus *Historica Plantarum*, three emendations in, 35 ff.
 Thessalia, girl's name, 197b
 Thomson's *Studies in the Odyssey*, noticed, 20 ff.
 Thoresby Jones' *Livy*, Bk. III., noticed, 240a
 Thumb (Professor Albert), obituary notice of, 221 f.
 τριῦμα, meaning of the term, at Athens, 6 ff.
Tod (Marcus N.), an archaic Thessalian epigram, 196 f.
 notes on some inscriptions from Asia Minor, 1 ff.
 notice of Larfeld's *Griechische Epigraphik*, 87 f.
 trochee, why disliked in fourth foot of hexameter, 168b, f.
Turner (R. L.), note on the word accent in Greek music, 195 f.
 uncanonical gospel, fragments of an, 60

U.

- Ure's *Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona in Boeotia*, noticed, 113 ff.

V.

- Varia (H. Richards), 10 ff.
 Varro *L. L.* (§ 173, Müll.), 79
 Vergil, the nationality of, 104 ff.
 Vergilius, the name, more probably Etrusco-Latin than Keltic, 105 ff.
Version, 64
 Vespa, notes on, 48 f.
 See also p. 95*b*
 Virgil, 225 ff.
 autograph MSS. of, 225*a*
 work of first editors of the *Aeneid*, 225*b*, f.
 problem of unfinished lines, 226*b*, f.
 other traces of incompleteness, 227 ff.

W.

- Wagner's *Galenī qui fertur libellus* ΕΙ ΖΩΙΟΝ ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑΣΤΡΟΣ, noticed, 115 f.
 Walser's *Poggius Florentinus Leben und Werke*, noticed, 246 ff.
Wardale (J. R.), Demosthenes, *περί τῶν Συμμοριῶν*, 5 ff.
 water clock, the probable error of a, 236 ff.
 Waterfowl Goddess Penelope, the, and her son Pan, 37 ff.

- Water-gods, the, and Aeneas, in the twentieth and twenty-first books of the *Iliad*, 70 ff.
Watson (Foster), Clenard as an educational pioneer, 65 ff., 97 ff., 129 ff.
 Way's *Sophocles in English Verse*, Part II.: *Aias, Electra, Trachinian Maidens, Philoctetes*, noticed, 28 f.
Webb (C. C. J.), notice of James' Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, 121 ff.
 Wegehaupt (Hans), the late, 32
 Weidmann's series, new volumes in, noticed, 185 f.
 'Wernicke's law,' 167*b*, f.
 Wilke's *Philodemi de Ira Liber*, noticed, 156
Williams (Miss M. V.), notice of Pohlenz's *Aus Plato's Werdezeit*, 219 f.
 word accent in Greek music, note on the, 195 f.
Wright (F. A.), on the derivation of *famulus*, *familia*, 204
 on the phrase *δορυκαμος ἀνδρῶν*, 111
Wright (Wilmer Cave), notice of Misson's *Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios*, 22 f.
 Wright's *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, noticed, 143 ff.

Z.

- Zeus, mountain and solar cults of, 80
 Zeus Ammon, worship of, in the Oasis, 836

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

- Aeschines:—
2 (*fin.*), 3 (156), 104b
- Aeschylus:—
Persae (13), 33 f.; (184), 10a; (231, 332), 34b f.; (337-360), 35; (537-540), 10a
P.V. (234 coll. *Soph. Ant.* 942, 919 coll. *Ant.* 1046, 937 coll. *Ant.* 768, 331 coll. *Ant.* 937, 200 coll. *Ant.* 259, 446 coll. *Ant.* 492, 383 coll. *Ant.* 780, 881 coll. *Ant.* 802), 9b
- Afranius:—
ap. Fest. 344 (19), 188b
- Andocides:—
I. (25), 103b
- Apollonius Rhodius:—
I. (43), III. (613, 676), IV. (1604), 11a
- Aristophanes:—
Aves (488-498), 111
Nubes (470), 11a
- Aristotle:—
de Mundo 399a (7), 111a
- Babrius:—
10 (5), 11b
- Caesar:—
ap. Suet. de Poetis, 172a
- Catullus:—
(84), 137 ff., 198 ff.
- Cicero:—
ad Att. xiii. 37 (2), xv. 29 (2), 79
Com. Fr. adesp. 1324 (K.)=*Lyr. Fr. adesp.* 23 (Bergk⁴), 134 f.
- Demosthenes:—
de Cherson. (14, 75), 101a
de Cor. (50), 102a; (289), 11b
de Falsa Leg. (16), 102a; (45, 86, 47, 73, 58, 59), 103a; (76, 89, 200, 209), 102b; (284), 11b
de Foedere (16), 102a
[*de Halon.*] (13), 101a
Leptines (36), 11b
de Megalop. (11), 102a
Ol. 2 (14, 15, 30), 100a
de Pace (11, coll. *de Cor.* 270, 277), 100b f.
- Demosthenes:—*continued.*
Phil. 1. (10), 12a; (32), 100a; (48, 51), 100b; 2. (25, 37), 101a; 3. (30); 4. (19, 39, 52), 101b
Symmor. (24), 11b
- Ennius:—
ap. Fest. 152 (18), 182 (17), 189a; 184 (5 coll. *Sen. Thyestes*, 497-503), 189b; 318 (35), 189b
- Euripides:—
H.F. (773-780), 68 f.
- Hesiod:—
Theog. (10, 43, 65, 67, 701, 830, 832), 193 ff.
- Homeric Hymns:—
in Aphr. (17-18), 163a; (136, 136 A), 163b; (228), 11a; (252, 284,)164a
in Apoll. (337), 161a
in Dionys. (VII. 43), 164a
in Herm. (109, 116), 161a; (133, 159), 161b; (346, 409-410, 436), 162a; (473), 162b; (486), 163a
X. (2-3, 4-5), 164b; XIX. (40), XXIV. (4), 165a; XXXI. (13), 165b
- Horace:—
A.P. (119-122), 75b; (128-9), 201a
Carm. I. xx. (9, 10), 76a; II. xx. (5-7), 76b; (6), 201a; III. xxiv. (3, 4), 76b
Epip. I. ii. (31), 200b; v. (3), 199 f.; xvii. (60), 200b; xix. (10), 201a; II. i. (70), 200b; (113-117), 18; (244), 201a
Sat. I. i. (108 sqq.), 75
- Isidore:—
VIII. xi. (§ 83), 139b, f., 220b
- Isocrates:—
7 (14), 103b; 12 (40), 15 (28, 141), 104a; 19 (43), 104b
- Little Iliad:—
Fr. ii. (3), 195b
- Livy:—
I. 34 (1), 239b

Lysias:—

- 2 (35, 61), 6 (21), 7 (6), 103a; 7 (33), 12 (60),
20 (12), 103b
Fr. 1 (5), 271 (90), 103b

O.

Ovid:—

- Tristia* I. i. (81), 46; 2 (86), 78; 5 (77), 46;
II. (215) 289 coll. *Ars. Am.* I. 361, 47;
III. 1 (38), 46b; 5 (7), 11 (62), 47a;
IV. 3 (69), V. 2 (46), 47a

P.

Pindar:—

- Pyth.* II. (90 sqq.), 77, 230 ff.

Plato:—

- Laws* (643D-E), 170a; (668A), 170b; (679D,
715C, 717A, 727A, 890A), 171a; (949D,
960D), 171b; (965A), 11b; (965E), 171b
Phaedo (62A), 69 f.
Rep. IV. (442A), 78; VII. (514B), 77b, f.

Plutarch:—

- Moralia* (385C, 387C, 388F, 392D, 395C,
397B, 401E, 404C, 407D), 253; (409, 410A,
413A, 415C, 424E, 439E), 234a; (440D,
442A, 479C, 481C, 481E, 483E, 493B-E),
234b; (497B, 498C, 499A, *ib.* E, 500A,
513A), 235a; (525A, *ib.* E, 528E, *ib.* F,
529C, 526A, 537E, 548B, 551E, 554F, 555D),
235b; (557F, 560C, 562A, 574A, 575C,
565D), 236a; (582A, 586A, 594F, 602B),
236b

- Romulus* (5), 11b

Propertius:—

- I. iii. (35-6), 40a; x. (2), xiii. (21-24), 40b f.;
xvi. (5-12), 41; xvi. (38), 41b
II. iii. (1), ix. (13), 42a; xxii. (39, 40), xxvi.
23, 4), 42b f.

Propertius:—continued.

- III. vi. (37, 38), 43 f.; viii. (29, 30), 44;
x. (27), 44b ff.

R.

- Rhetorica ad Herennium* iv. (68), 236 f.

S.

Sophocles:—

- Fr. (787), 10b
O.T. (814), 11a; (1219 coll. Aesch. Fr. 382),
203 f.
Trach. (331 coll. Andoc. II. 8, Aesch. Fr.
177), 212

T.

Terence:—

- Eunuchus* (835-839), 18b, f.
Heaut. (Prol. 28-35), 172 f.; (958), 173

Theocritus:—

- Idyll* xv. (112), 18a

Theophrastus:—

- H.P. I. 13 (5), 35 f.; 2. 8 (3), 36 f.; 3. 18
(12), 37

V.

Varro:—

- L.L. 5 (§ 173, Müll.), 79b

Vespa:—

- P.L.M. iv. p. 379 Baehrens (vv. 1, 11, 30,
31, 82), 48b, f.

Virgil:—

- G. iv. (40), 148b

III.—INDEX VERBORUM.

A.—GREEK.

αἰδῶν, 'Elegy,' 148 ^b	A.	καταποντίζειν, 174 ^b	K.
Ἀθήνη, 71 ^a		κορύσσεται, 135 ^a	
ἄθλος, 'ordeal,' 9 ^b		κύτταρος, 37 ^a	
Αἰσωπος = αἴσιος, 25 ^b			Λ.
ἄλλα δῆτα, 102 ^b		λῆναι, 'Maenads,' 84 ^a	
ἄμφιπολος, 215 ^b		ληναίξειν, 84 ^a	
ἄπιστεῖν, 'disobey,' 9 ^b			Μ.
ἄρνα, 39 ^a		(?) μεσοῦσθαι, 111 ^a	
ἄσυλλα, 60 ^b		μέτωπον, 25 ^a	
	B.		N.
βαπτίζειν, 174 ^b		Ναζαρηνός, Ναζωραῖος, 118 ^a , 1 ^b	
Βάτος, Βάτων, 73 ^a		νεώτερος, 2 ^b f.	
	Γ.		O.
(?) γαληνήεις, 135 ^b		ὄρχαμος, ὄρχατος, 111 ^b f.	
γλαυκῶπις, 71 ^a		ὄρχος, 111 ^b f.	
	Δ.	ὄσσα (Hes.), 193 ff.	
* Δαπος, 24 ^b			Π.
δεινὸν εἰ, 70 ^a		πατρομύστης, 2 ^a	
διά with (1) acc. (2) gen., 194 ^a		περικαλλής, 194 ^b	
δίωτος, 36 ^a		πλάστιγξ, 'horse-collar,' 77 ^b	
	E.	πνεῦμα, 'a ripple,' 135 ^a	
εἰσηλύσιον, 'entrance fee,' 2 ^a		πρεσβύτερος, 2 ^b f.	
ἐλικῶπες, 71 ^a		πρόσωπον, 25 ^a	
ἐπαιτιῶμαι, 9 ^b			Σ.
ἐπεγείρω, 135 ^b , n.		στάθμη, 77, 230 ff.	
ἐπηετανόν (Hes.), 194 ^b			T.
ἐπίρατος, 194 ^b		ταγός, 'king,' 9 ^b	
Ἐπιτυχάνων, 3 ^b		τιμή, 'honorific oblation,' 171 ^a	
ἐπίφθονος, 215 ^b		τίμημα, 6 f.	
ἐπίχειρα, 'guerdon,' 9 ^b			Υ.
(?) εὐναιδέα, 60 ^a		ὑποβρυχίας, 161 ^a	
	Z.		Φ.
ζυγόν, 77 ^b			
	H.	φέγω, 'glorify,' 163 ^a	
Ἡγεμονεύς, 4 ^a		φιλόπατρις, 4 ^a	
	Θ.		Ω.
θανμαστὸν εἰ, 70 ^a			
θανματοποιοί, 77 ^b , f.			
	I		
ἱάμα, 204 ^a		ῶρα, 135 ^b	

B.—LATIN.

A.
ad perpendiculum exigere, 125b

B.
Belgica esseda, 148a

C.
cessatum = *qui cessavit*, 200b
chommoda, 137b, f.
cognitor, 185a
commulcium, 79a
concinmitas, 124b
cum ait, 188

D.
demergere, 174b
devia, 'solitary,' 184b
distraho, 'sell,' 155b

E.
ēadem, ēandem, 177a, n.
edo, 'eat,' 127
euangelium, 123b
extis, 'anaemic,' 78b, f.

F.
famulus, familia, 204
favisae, 43a
ferre gaudia, 44a, b

G.
gignentia, 140a

H.
habere notam, 43b
hinsidias, 138b
Hionios, 139a, b

I.
Iliacum carmen, 'a book of the *Iliad*,' 201b
inamoenus, 44a
? *iocare*, 76b
nubere, 76a
iuratus (act.), 200b

M.
mathesis) (*matesis*, 123b
mergo, 174a
mersare, 174b
? *Metaponticum*, 76b
modicus, 19b

N.
nefrendem, 122b

P.
promittere, 19b
propolis, 148b, f.

R.
(?) *redhostimen*, 189b
rupes, 184b

S.
Sabellicus sus, 148a
scopulus, 184b
sestertius = *semis tertius*, 79b
statera, 77b
supremo sole, 200

T.
tibi bene volo, 173b
titubata solo, 206b

U.
uri, 'buffaloes,' 148a

PA
1
C7
v.29

The classical review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
